

John W. Runkle to be postmaster at Middleburg, Pa., in place of John N. Brosius. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1915.

Ralph W. Simcox to be postmaster at Sandy Lake, Pa., in place of William A. Boyd. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1915.

Lester N. Strickler to be postmaster at Vanderbilt, Pa., in place of Eli P. Clifton. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1915.

Theodore E. Warner to be postmaster at New Oxford, Pa., in place of William H. Emmert. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1915.

Thomas Wood to be postmaster at Muncy, Pa., in place of William F. Brittain. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1915.

Andrew J. Young to be postmaster at Pen Argyl, Pa., in place of John H. Jackson, removed.

John C. Barclay to be postmaster at Clearfield, Pa., in place of John H. Martin, removed.

RHODE ISLAND.

Ruth A. Vars to be postmaster at Bradford, R. I. Office became presidential October 1, 1914.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

H. H. Swift to be postmaster at Arlington, S. Dak., in place of Adam Royhl. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1915.

TENNESSEE.

James M. Cates to be postmaster at Maryville, Tenn., in place of M. H. Edmondson. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1915.

William E. Snodgrass to be postmaster at Spring City, Tenn., in place of James F. Collins. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1915.

TEXAS.

Lloyd E. Lockhart to be postmaster at Van Horn, Tex. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

Georgia B. Welch to be postmaster at Corpus Christi, Tex., in place of E. G. Crabbe. Incumbent's commission expires April 24, 1915.

VIRGINIA.

E. E. Miles to be postmaster at Onancock, Va., in place of William H. Parker. Incumbent's commission expires March 3, 1915.

Clarence W. Garrett to be postmaster at Bowling Green, Va., in place of E. B. Travis. Incumbent's commission expires February 23, 1915.

Emmet W. Skinner to be postmaster at Falls Church, Va., in place of Ozias B. Livingston, removed.

WASHINGTON.

Constance C. Clark to be postmaster at Montesano, Wash., in place of Fremont A. Tarr. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1915.

Nelson Murray to be postmaster at Roy, Wash. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

WEST VIRGINIA.

John Haynes to be postmaster at Hinton, W. Va., in place of Harvey Ewart, deceased.

WISCONSIN.

Oscar Hanisch to be postmaster at Waupun, Wis., in place of James W. Melklejohn. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1915.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 20 (legislative day of Feb. 19), 1915.

ASSISTANT TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES.

William W. Heard to be Assistant Treasurer of the United States at New Orleans, La.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

Chesterfield C. Middlebrooks to be United States marshal for the district of Connecticut.

John J. Mitchell to be United States marshal for the district of Massachusetts.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Guy Whitlock to be a lieutenant commander.

Lieut. Roe R. Adams to be a lieutenant commander.

Lieut. James P. Murdock to be a lieutenant commander.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles C. Slayton to be a lieutenant.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Irving H. Mayfield to be a lieutenant.

Ensign Daniel A. McElduff to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Ensign Charles C. Davis to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Asst. Surg. John C. Parham to be a passed assistant surgeon.

POSTMASTERS.

FLORIDA.

Orlando E. Hannah, Tavares.

INDIANA.

Henry B. Snyder, Gary.

IOWA.

C. F. Duncombe, Fort Dodge.

Martin F. Kelly, Dewitt.

Pearl L. Maier, Dumont.

George W. McKeehan, Cincinnati.

Earl P. Patten, Danbury.

H. R. Richards, Churdan.

J. E. Spence, Milton.

Thomas P. Watson, Dows.

KANSAS.

Hiram R. Fulton, Hanover.

John E. Hare, Cunningham.

William L. Scott, Sharon Springs.

MARYLAND.

Charles A. Deffinbaugh, Oakland.

B. C. Lefever, Williamsport.

Patrick T. McGann, Frostburg.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Daniel A. Donnelly, Walpole.

MONTANA.

William Cluston, Great Falls.

P. J. Conway, Fromberg.

Lucile D. Knight, Twin Bridges.

MISSOURI.

Tinsley Brown, Hamilton.

John E. Cherry, Mount Vernon.

J. Thomas Fisher, Jefferson City.

Jefferson B. Robertson, Brunswick.

Harry E. Shepherd, Seneca.

NEBRASKA.

Charles E. Lewin, Comstock.

Nils Lindskog, Pilger.

George P. Miller, Papillion.

Herbert O. Paine, Cook.

William Sweeney, Emerson.

OHIO.

Fred M. Black, Greenwich.

Carroll R. Jackson, Gambier.

F. W. Maiberger, Monroeville.

Horace E. McConnell, Milford Center.

RHODE ISLAND.

E. W. Perry Greenman, Narragansett Pier.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Paul H. E. Sloan, jr., Pendleton.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

P. H. Murphy, Henry.

VERMONT.

James E. Burke, Burlington.

Daniel H. Cray, Bellows Falls.

George W. Gorman, Barre.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, February 20, 1915.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God Almighty, our Father in heaven, in spite of the untoward circumstances of life, its sorrows, disappointments, and the untold miseries growing out of the awful war in Europe, its brutalizing and barbaric effects, strengthen our arm of faith and help us to believe that out of it all shall come to humanity a larger, nobler, grander life, a peace world-wide, that shall unite all peoples of all climes into one great brotherhood that shall make peace stronger than war and good the ruling passion of mankind.

That nothing walks with aimless feet,
That not one life shall be destroyed
Or cast as rubbish to the wind,
When God hath made the pile complete.
Behold, we know not anything;
We can but trust that good shall fall
At last—far off at last—to all,
And every winter change to spring.

For Thou art God, and Thou art good. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, on the day before yesterday I stated that there was a surplus of \$7,658,572.87 from the \$169,000,000 appropriation for pensions for the current year. This was a slip of the tongue. That surplus was from the \$180,000,000 appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914. I ask to make that correction, and to place in the Record a letter from the Commissioner of Pensions calling attention to it.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the request of the gentleman will be granted.

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, February 19, 1915.

HON. CHARLES L. BARTLETT,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BARTLETT: I call your attention to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, dated February 18, 1915, page 4064, in which you are made to say that there was a surplus of \$7,658,572.87 from the \$169,000,000 appropriation.

This is an error. That surplus was from the \$180,000,000 appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914. The \$169,000,000 appropriation is for the current year ending June 30, 1915.

This is an important matter, and I think this correction ought to be presented to Congress and made to appear in the Record.

You will notice on page 1 of the hearings before your committee, December 16, 1914, the statement that there was \$180,000,000 appropriated, and from that there was a surplus left of \$7,658,572.87. At the bottom of that page and at the beginning of the next page is a very careful statement of just how this exact sum was arrived at.

Thanking you for your attention to this matter, I am,

Very respectfully,

G. M. SALTZGABER, Commissioner.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 17982. An act to make Nyando, N. Y., a port through which merchandise may be imported for transportation without appraisement.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 2335. An act to provide for the register and enrollment of vessels built in foreign countries when such vessels have been wrecked on the coasts of the United States or her possessions or adjacent waters and saved by American citizens and repaired in American shipyards.

PENSIONS.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 6980) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The conference report was read.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1427).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 6980) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 3, 5, 6, 7, 10, and 13, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 4, 8, 9, and 12.

Amendment numbered 11: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed therein insert the sum "\$24"; and the House agree to the same.

JOE J. RUSSELL,
M. E. BURKE,
JNO. W. LANGLEY,
Managers on the part of the House.

BENJ. F. SHIVELY,
CHARLES F. JOHNSON,
LW. Y. SHERMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments

of the House to the bill (S. 6980) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report as to each of the said amendments, viz:

Amendment No. 1: House recedes. The evidence filed warrants proposed increase.

Amendment No. 2: House recedes. The circumstances in this case fully justify proposed pension.

Amendment No. 3: Senate concurs. The evidence in this case does not warrant a higher rate.

Amendment No. 4: House recedes. Claimant is the widow of two Civil War soldiers. Proposed pension is justified by the circumstances in the case.

Amendment No. 5: Senate concurs. The rate proposed by the House amendment is deemed sufficient.

Amendment No. 6: Senate concurs. The rate proposed by the House conforms to the rules of the committees.

Amendment No. 7: Senate concurs. A higher rate than that proposed is not justified.

Amendment No. 8: House recedes: Proposed increase is fully warranted by the evidence.

Amendment No. 9: House recedes. Proposed pension is fully justified by the proofs on file.

Amendment No. 10: Senate concurs. The circumstances in this case warrant proposed increase.

Amendment No. 11: Senate concurs in the House amendment with an amendment allowing \$24. This is justified by the circumstances of the case and the proofs on file.

Amendment No. 12: House recedes. Proposed increase is fully justified by the evidence on file.

Amendment No. 13: Senate concurs. The evidence on file does not warrant proposed increase.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 7213) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The conference report was read.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1426).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 7213) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, and 15, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 5, and 12.

Amendment numbered 4: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, and in lieu of the sum proposed therein insert the sum "\$30"; and the House agree to the same.

JOE J. RUSSELL,
M. E. BURKE,
JNO. W. LANGLEY,
Managers on the part of the House.
BENJ. F. SHIVELY,
CHARLES F. JOHNSON,
LW. Y. SHERMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the House to the bill (S. 7213) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report as to each of the said amendments, viz:

Amendment No. 1: House recedes. Proposed increase is fully justified by the evidence.

Amendment No. 2: House recedes. Proposed pension is justified by the circumstances in the case.

Amendment No. 3: Senate concurs. The proofs on file do not warrant proposed increase.

Amendment No. 4: The Senate concurs with an amendment allowing \$30. This amount is warranted by the evidence on file in the case.

Amendment No. 5: House recedes. Proposed pension is justified by the evidence.

Amendment No. 6: Senate concurs. Short service of soldier does not warrant proposed pension.

Amendment No. 7: Senate concurs. Higher rate is not justified by the evidence.

Amendment No. 8: Senate concurs. The beneficiary is dead.

Amendment No. 9: Senate concurs. Soldier is dead.

Amendment No. 10: Senate concurs. Soldier is dead.

Amendment No. 11: Senate concurs. Higher rate is not justified by the evidence.

Amendment No. 12: House recedes. The evidence fully justifies proposed increase.

Amendment No. 13: Senate concurs. Proposed increase is justified by the circumstances in this case.

Amendment No. 14: Senate concurs. The rate proposed by the House is justified by the evidence on file.

Amendment No. 15: Senate concurs. The evidence in this case does not warrant proposed increase.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 7402) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The conference report was read.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1425).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 7402) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 8 and 13, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, and 16.

Amendment numbered 3: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, and in lieu of the sum proposed therein insert the sum "\$36"; and the House agree to the same.

JOE J. RUSSELL,
M. E. BURKE,
JNO. W. LANGLEY,

Managers on the part of the House.

BENJ. F. SHIVELY,
CHARLES F. JOHNSON,
LW. Y. SHERMAN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the House to the bill (S. 7402) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report as to each of the said amendments, viz:

Amendment No. 1: House recedes. The evidence on file in this case fully justifies proposed pension.

Amendment No. 2: House recedes: Soldier is blind and proposed rate is not excessive.

Amendment No. 3: Senate concurs with an amendment allowing \$36, and the House agrees thereto. The proofs fully justify this amount.

Amendment No. 4: House recedes. The evidence on file fully justifies proposed pension.

Amendment No. 5: House recedes. The rate proposed is not excessive under the rules of both committees.

Amendment No. 6: House recedes. The evidence justifies proposed increase.

Amendment No. 7: House recedes. Claimant's present physical and financial condition, as shown by the evidence, fully justifies proposed increase.

Amendment No. 8: Senate concurs, in accordance with the rules of the committee.

Amendment No. 9: House recedes. The circumstances in this case justify proposed increase.

Amendment No. 10: House recedes. Proposed pension is warranted by the evidence on file.

Amendment No. 11: House recedes. The circumstances in this case fully justify proposed pension.

Amendment No. 12: House recedes. Evidence filed in support of this case justifies proposed pension.

Amendment No. 13: Senate concurs. The rate proposed is justified by the evidence and soldier's rank.

Amendment No. 14: House recedes. The proposed increase of pension is fully justified by soldier's long service and his present physical condition.

Amendment No. 15: House recedes. The circumstances in this case warrant proposed increase.

Amendment No. 16: House recedes. The evidence on file justifies proposed pension.

The conference report was agreed to.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, LAREDO, TEX.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 672.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the House of Representatives all papers or copies thereof and all facts in his possession with reference to the conduct of the collector of customs of the Laredo district, in the State of Texas, as shown by all reports and papers received at the Treasury Department since January 1, 1914; also the number of days said collector has been absent from his duties since said date.

The resolution was agreed to.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATIONS.

On motion of Mr. FLOOD of Virginia, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 21201) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, with Mr. LINTHICUM in the chair.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, last evening the committee had under discussion the item on page 20 appropriating \$493,000 for clerk hire, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] was discussing this item, and I gathered from his remarks that he did not entirely approve of it.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is one of the most indefatigable Members that we have in the House. There is hardly anyone who gives us more information or who studies these bills more carefully. And yet I have had just a suspicion that the gentleman from Wisconsin in discussing this item did not fully grasp the Democratic methods of administering the Consular Service. He objects because there is something like \$113,000 added to this item, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State. Why should my friend from Wisconsin be astonished at that? Has not the Secretary of State himself announced that it is necessary to find positions for the effective campaign workers? And how, let me ask our friend from Wisconsin, could we better assist him in that laudable enterprise than by adding \$113,000 to this item, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State, in order that deserving campaign workers can be rewarded?

Mr. ANDERSON. Are we to understand that the gentleman thinks it better to employ these Democrats outside of the United States?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think there might be some benefit in that.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. In a moment. Does my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] realize, as the Secretary of State has stated, how important it is and how difficult it is to find places for deserving campaign workers?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not know of any question pending before the House.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will move to strike out the last word, but I was speaking in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. COX. I suppose the gentleman knows that these employees are all under the civil service—

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, no.

Mr. COX. Well, wait, or else get up and make your objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. No; I will not. Does the gentleman object to sending American employees and American clerks abroad, or would he rather the State Department would hire foreign employees to do this work?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I was going to suggest how this money might be properly expended by the Secretary of State in order that this extremely desirable purpose might be carried out. Something like a year ago we had in the city of Council Bluffs an election. At the close of the election a number of citizens sought the Democratic headquarters in the town and presented certain slips of paper, which purported to state that they had been working through the day for the benefit of the Democratic Party. Upon the presentation of these certificates they received the sum of \$2 each for the day. There were unkind and uncharitable persons in the vicinity who said that they had not been working for the party, but had simply sold their votes; but I do not care to discuss that matter at this time, knowing, as we do, from the distinguished Secretary how valuable the services of party workers may be. If they had been at work for the Democratic Party at the extremely small price of \$2 a day, I judge, from the statement of the Secretary of State, that would not be a sufficient reward for them to receive. I would suggest also that a very large reward ought to be obtained out of the sum we are appropriating for the parties who managed to hire them to work for the Democratic Party on that occasion at this rate.

Gentlemen can see how important this is that we should increase these appropriations for the purpose of recompensing the services of party workers and provide money which would be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State, no matter if we do face a deficit in the Treasury, no matter if we are short of funds and that the shortage is constantly increasing. The gentleman from Wisconsin can hardly expect under the circumstances that the appropriation will be reduced.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Do I understand the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] offered an amendment to strike out the increase?

Mr. STAFFORD. No; I moved to strike out the last figure, which is a cipher.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, in reference to this increase I desire to say that the committee deemed it necessary and the department deemed it necessary. I note what the gentleman from Iowa says about the Secretary of State and the letter he wrote to Mr. Vick in reference to deserving Democrats. It but illustrates the weakness of the arguments that the Republican partisans can make against the present administration, particularly the Secretary of State. That is a matter that is continually alluded to in this House by this gentleman. If that is all that can be brought against the Democratic administration or the Secretary of State, if that class of arguments is all the gentleman can suggest to the discredit of this administration, the nominee of the Republican Party in 1916 will carry fewer States even than the nominee carried in 1912. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This item was recommended not only by the Secretary of State, but by an official of the State Department who has been there for at least three or four administrations. The head of the Consular Bureau in the State Department is a gentleman who has been in the service of that department for quite a number of years—I do not recall how many, but certainly he was there under President Roosevelt and under President Taft. He is a Republican in politics, and notwithstanding his political affiliations he is a most efficient official. I want to read to those gentlemen who are trying to make political capital out of the effort of the department to give the country a chance to embrace the splendid opportunities it now has and what this gentleman says about the increase. I refer to Mr. Wilbur J. Carr:

The demands on the Consular Service even before this war began had very greatly increased. Our business men are taking a great deal more interest in foreign trade and the Department of Commerce is increasing its activities and thereby increasing the demands on our consuls for commercial information and assistance. Almost every session of Congress enacts new legislation which imposes some new duty upon the Consular Service. The last tariff act, for example, imposed upon the Consular Service the duty of doing a lot of statistical work which had not before been required, and all of that necessitates a great deal of clerical work.

I want to say that most of these are Republicans, men who were put into the Consular Service before the consular reorganization act went into effect, and they were covered in as

civil-service employees of this Government. Mr. Carr continues:

When we made our allotments beginning on the 1st of July of the current year we denied requests from our consuls for increased assistance amounting to over \$74,000 which we did not have the money to meet. There are other offices that we know of where we would like to get certain work done, which would cost probably \$30,000 or \$40,000 more. The sum total of our requests and the needs as we see them in the service under normal conditions is about \$117,000 for clerical assistance.

Then he goes on to strongly advocate this in the commercial interests of the country, and the Secretary of State did so for the same reason.

I know nothing of the political corruption of the State of the gentleman from Iowa, but if he says it is corrupt I do not take issue with him. I know in our State, which is Democratic, we have no such condition as that. I want to say that if we do want to reward deserving Democrats and undeserving Republicans, we want to get Americans in these offices, men who are American citizens and who will look strictly after the interests of the American people and the American Government, and we want to pay them a decent salary.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I want to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill whether any Member on the other side of the aisle has offered a motion to strike this increase from the bill.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. No; I asked the gentleman from Wisconsin if he did and he said no.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moved to strike out the last cipher, which would reduce the amount.

Mr. ADAIR. What I desire to know is if the gentleman from Wisconsin insists on his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin withdrew his amendment on yesterday.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, no, Mr. Chairman; I did not withdraw my amendment yesterday.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, the point I desire to make is this: I listened yesterday afternoon to my good friend from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD]. He did not exactly discuss the question. We all understood of course that what he said was for political purposes. I was inclined to believe that the gentleman was not sincere at the time he was discussing the matter, but that the statements he was making were made purely for political purposes. I am quite sure that the gentleman from Wisconsin prefers the employment of Americans rather than foreigners, and that the only purpose he had in saying what he did last evening was to lead the country to believe this administration was seeking to increase the pay roll for the benefit of Democratic workers. Let that be as it may, I think we all agree that it is much better to employ Americans in doing this service for the Government than foreigners, and I am sure before this matter is closed the gentleman from Wisconsin will withdraw his amendment, which will be sufficient evidence to all of us that his purpose in making the remarks he did was purely political, and that he had really no criticism to make of the merits of the proposition contained in the bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, whenever anyone on this side of the House proposes to reduce an appropriation some distinguished gentleman, like the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], who has just addressed the House, says it is for political purposes. The gentleman from Indiana, who has never been noted as an economist, thinks that any proposition to keep us from squandering money out of the Treasury is for political purposes, and I do not doubt it from his viewpoint.

May I ask the gentleman from Virginia a few questions in reference to the item? There is an increase in the item for clerk hire at consulates of more than \$100,000.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD], in charge of the bill, has indicated first that the purpose is to place American clerks in the consulates instead of clerks of foreign nationalities, and also for the purpose of giving our business interests more advantages in the way of information from abroad. We are maintaining under the Department of Commerce, I will not say an expensive establishment because I do not think it is expensive, but one that has very largely increased in the last few years, for the purpose of maintaining commercial attachés abroad to obtain this very information. How far is it intended to duplicate this work, may I ask? A few years ago it was indicated that the consuls were not intended to do the commercial work abroad, except such as comes within the scope of their work as consuls. There was considerable discussion about that, and there has been more or less rivalry all of the time between the Department of Commerce and the Department of State in reference to this work.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, there is no purpose on the part of the State Department to duplicate this work, and

I do not believe there is much danger of duplication, because the activities of the Department of Commerce are necessarily limited by the small number of attachés which they have for this work, and those they have will cooperate with the consuls in the places to which they are sent, and the work will not be a duplication, but will be an aid to the consul.

Mr. MANN. Is this increase in the main, as the gentleman understands it, for the purpose of employing American citizens as clerks instead of citizens of foreign nationalities or is it designed also to increase the number of clerks or the salaries of clerks now in the service?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It is for all three purposes. It is to eliminate the foreign clerks who get a very much smaller salary than we could get American clerks for, and that will necessitate an increase in the pay of the individual clerks, and also it is designed for the purpose of giving more clerical assistance to the consuls; more than they have now, so that it is for all three purposes—to eliminate foreigners, to increase the salaries of clerks, and to increase the number of clerks.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned, I am not particularly in sympathy with the idea that all of the clerks in consulates abroad shall be American citizens. I have not any doubt at all that in many places a consul can employ a foreigner as a clerk at \$600 a year who will be worth three times as much as an American clerk sent from here over there would be worth, to whom we would have to pay twelve or fifteen hundred dollars a year. The foreigner not only talks the language, but he understands the situation locally, which the American clerk sent from here would not, although he may in a way talk the language.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New York. In some cases these clerks act as vice consuls, and in the absence of the consul they act as consul. That makes it imperative, does it not, that they shall be Americans?

Mr. MANN. No; it does not. There are lots of consuls in the United States of foreign countries who are American citizens. It is a purely business proposition. These men have no diplomatic duties to perform.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Still, the gentleman recalls that it has been the policy of Congress, beginning back eight or nine years ago, to have American clerks in the consulates?

Mr. MANN. I think not. I think the very fact that this year you raised the appropriation from \$375,000 to \$493,000 for this purpose shows that it has not been the policy of Congress heretofore. I know there has been discussion about it.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. But they have heretofore raised this very appropriation for that very purpose, and the work has been going on. The foreign clerks have been gotten rid of to some extent and Americans substituted in their places.

Mr. MANN. I understand that.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. And in a number of instances we have increased the appropriations for that purpose. This is to continue that work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. What is the motion before the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The motion pending is to strike out the last word, offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. That would make this appropriation \$49,300 instead of \$493,000.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment already pending before the House, to strike out the last word.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to this fact, which I think ought to go in the Record—that is, that the cost of this Consular Service to the Government is not anything like what you would naturally suppose it to be without having the full information which is given in House Document 1259, and I quote from page 54:

Expended for the maintenance of the Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914. \$2,083,908.42. Less fees collected and deposited in the Treasury (statement No. 19), \$2,040,234.42—

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLINE. Wait until I finish the statement—leaving a balance of \$43,674.

Now I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. In line with the figures which the gentleman gave, can the gentleman give the total appropriations that are carried in this bill? I notice in some items there is a re-appropriation of balances running back to the end of time. Will the gentleman give us the actual amount of appropriations carried in this bill?

Mr. CLINE. I think the gentleman can be furnished with that information if he will designate the particular items.

Mr. STAFFORD. I mean the total appropriations carried in the bill. The report does not give it; the report only gives the total amounts carried, and yet in many items we find appropriations stating that the appropriations available for prior years shall be utilizable for these items. We have nothing presented as to the real amount of appropriations carried in the bill.

Mr. CLINE. I will say to the gentleman that that policy has been largely curtailed by the committee at this session, and I think it will be completely curtailed hereafter. For illustration, in the Canadian boundary there was an unexpended balance of \$51,000; that, together with \$40,000 carried in this present bill, makes \$91,000, and the expenditure last year was \$93,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. So I understand it is to be the policy of the committee hereafter that they will desist from the practice of making available all the unexpended balances and will appropriate only the various amounts specifically needed.

Mr. CLINE. The policy hereafter, as I understand it, would be to let these unexpended balances go back into the Treasury and appropriate definite amounts.

Mr. STAFFORD. I certainly approve of that policy, because as it is no one knows definitely the amount that is being appropriated.

Mr. CLINE. I desire to call attention to another fact. We are in favor of putting American secretaries with the Consular Service, for the reason that it has been demonstrated by Germany in the South American trade that the most efficient means to build up German trade in South American countries was the employment of trained men exclusively for that service. A competent American secretary who knows our business, our method of manufacture, our resources in manufacture, and has a personal and rational interest in our business, who is able to speak of the quality of our goods is much more efficient in the service than is the foreigner in introducing those goods; and that is particularly true of this kind of service from the fact that we are always reaching out and developing all the industries of this country as largely as possible to increase our foreign trade, and that is one of the efficient ways in which we think we can increase that business.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word in opposition to this amendment along the line suggested by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE], who has just taken his seat. Now, if it is true that the employment of American labor will increase our foreign trade, I am in favor of it. I think my distinguished friend from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is mistaken in arguing that there is no necessity for this increased appropriation. The chairman of the committee has told you it is for the purpose of increasing our foreign trade. Well, if there is anything that will increase that trade, we ought to have it. Prior to the time of the war in Europe we were losing our foreign trade at the rate of a million dollars every day. Seven months prior to the war in Europe we lost our foreign trade to the extent of over \$248,000,000. Now, if this appropriation is going to increase our foreign trade, then we ought to make the increased appropriation. Gentlemen over on the other side have cited the case of South America. Last October Argentina increased her trade with us over 400 per cent. We have lost in our foreign trade with every nation of the earth under this administration up until the time of the war in Europe, and if this money is to be expended for the purpose of increasing our foreign trade, then everybody ought to be in favor of it.

Mr. ADAIR. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. ADAIR. Did not the gentleman state upon this floor a few days ago that in the month of December of this year we actually exported more American products than ever before in a month of December?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not know whether I did or not, but I think that is true.

Mr. ADAIR. Then our foreign trade is not going to the bad so fast, then?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I said prior to the war. Of course the war increased our exports, but, notwithstanding the war, the imports from England since this war commenced increased during the month of October over 26 per cent. There

is no nation on the face of the earth to-day, except those engaged in that great contest, but what our trade has decreased with them, every one of them. It has changed to some extent in our exports since the war came. While we all regret that great contest, yet it has benefited us industrially. As I said awhile ago, I hope my friend from Wisconsin will not object, because if this is going to increase our foreign trade everybody ought to be for it. During the first 10 months the Underwood law was upon the statute books Canada increased her trade with us 15 per cent. We lost in our trade with her 35 per cent. So the increase in 10 months after this present law went upon the statute books, with the best customer we have upon the face of the earth to-day, was 50 per cent in favor of the foreigner; so if this increase in appropriations will increase our foreign trade I think every man ought to vote for it.

As bearing on our foreign trade, I call attention to the following statement taken from the letter of the British secretary of state for foreign affairs to the American ambassador, under date of February 10, 1915:

Taking the figures in millions of dollars, the exports of merchandise from the United States for the seven months of January to July, 1914, inclusive, were 1,201, as compared with 1,327 in the corresponding months of 1913, a drop of \$126,000,000.

For the months of August, September, October, and November—that is to say, for the four months of the war preceding the delivery of Your Excellency's note—the figures of the exports of merchandise were—again in millions of dollars—667, as compared with 923 in the corresponding months of 1913, a drop of \$246,000,000.

If, however, the single article of cotton be eliminated from the comparison, the figures show a very different result. Thus the exports of all articles of merchandise other than cotton from the United States during the first seven months of 1914 were \$966,000,000, as against \$1,127,000,000 in 1913, a drop of \$161,000,000, or 14½ per cent. On the other hand, the exports of the same articles during the months of August and November amounted to \$608,000,000, as compared with \$630,000,000 in 1913, a drop of \$22,000,000, or less than 4 per cent.

It is therefore clear that, if cotton be excluded, the effect of the war has been not to increase but practically to arrest the decline of American exports which was in progress earlier in the year. In fact, any decrease in American exports which is attributed to the war is essentially due to cotton. Cotton is an article which can not possibly have been affected by the exercise of our belligerent rights, for, as Your Excellency is aware, it has not been declared by His Majesty's Government to be contraband of war, and the rules under which we are at present conducting our belligerent operations give us no power in the absence of a blockade to seize or interfere with it when on its way to a belligerent country in neutral ships. Consequently no cotton has been touched.

Into the causes of the decrease in the exports of cotton I do not feel that there is any need for me to enter, because, whatever may have been the cause, it is not to be found in the exercise of the belligerent rights of visitation, search, and capture, or in our general right when at war to intercept the contraband trade of our enemy. Imports of cotton to the United Kingdom fell as heavily as those to other countries. No place felt the outbreak of war more acutely than the cotton districts of Lancashire, where for a time an immense number of spindles were idle. Though this condition has now to a large extent passed away, the consumption of the raw material in Great Britain was temporarily much diminished. The same is no doubt true of France.

The general result is to show convincingly that the naval operations of Great Britain are not the cause of any diminution in the volume of American exports, and that if the commerce of the United States is in the unfavorable condition which Your Excellency describes, the cause ought in fairness to be sought elsewhere than in the activities of His Majesty's naval forces.

I may add that the circular issued by the Department of Commerce at Washington on the 23d January admits a marked improvement in the foreign trade of the United States of America, which we have noted with great satisfaction. The first paragraph of the circular is worth quoting verbatim:

"A marked improvement in our foreign trade is indicated by the latest reports issued by the Department of Commerce through its Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, sales of foodstuffs and certain lines of manufactures having been unusually large in November, the latest period for which detailed information is at hand. In that month exports aggregated \$206,000,000, or double the total for August last, when, by reason of the outbreak of war, our foreign trade fell to the lowest level reached in many years. In December there was further improvement, the month's exports being valued at \$246,000,000, compared with \$233,000,000 in December, 1913, and within \$4,000,000 of the high record established in December, 1912."

A better view of the situation is obtained by looking at these figures month by month. The exports of merchandise for the last five months have been—in millions of dollars: August, 110; September, 156; October, 194; November, 205; December, 246.

The outbreak of war produced in the United States, as it did in all neutral countries, an acute but temporary disturbance of trade. Since that time there seems to have been a steady recovery, for to-day the exports from the United States stand at a higher figure than on the same date last year.

Before passing away from the statistics of trade, and in order to demonstrate still more clearly if necessary that the naval operations of Great Britain and her allies have had no detrimental effect on the volume of trade between the United States and neutral countries, it is worth while to analyze the figures of the exports to Europe since the outbreak of hostilities. For this purpose the European countries ought to be grouped under three heads—Great Britain and those fighting with her, neutral countries, and enemy countries. It is, however, impossible for me to group the countries in this way satisfactorily, as the figures relating to the export trade of the United States with each country have not yet been published. In the preliminary statement of the export trade of the United States with foreign countries, only principal countries are shown and various countries which are tabulated separately in the more detailed monthly summary of commerce and finance are omitted. Those omitted include not only the Scandinavian

countries, the exports to which are of peculiar importance in dealing with this question, but also Austria.

So far as it is possible to distribute the figures under the headings which I have indicated above—all the figures being given in thousands of dollars—the results are as follows:

Total exports to Europe from the 1st August to the 30th November, 413,995, as against 597,342. Of these Great Britain and her allies took 285,312, as against 316,805 in 1913. Germany and Belgium took 1,881, as against 177,136 in 1913, whereas neutral countries—among which Austria-Hungary is unavoidably included—took 123,802, as against 103,401 in 1913.

The general complaint in Your Excellency's note was that the action of Great Britain was affecting adversely the trade of the United States with neutral countries. The naval operations of Great Britain certainly do not interfere with commerce from the United States on its way to the United Kingdom and the allied countries, and yet the exports to Great Britain and her allies during those four months diminished to the extent of over \$28,000,000, whereas those to neutral countries and Austria increased by over \$20,000,000.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin withdraw the pro forma amendment?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will accommodate the gentleman from New York by having it remain a little longer.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Chairman, I want to say something in connection with the employment of American clerks in consulates. Recently on the border opposite Buffalo two Americans were shot by Canadian soldiers. At the time that incident occurred the consul at Fort Erie was absent on leave. His assistant, a clerk, was in charge. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] states that consuls do not have to perform diplomatic work. As a matter of fact, this clerk in charge was the American representative at Fort Erie at that time. In Toronto, just a few miles away, the clerk is a Canadian. Now, we would not be in a fortunate position if that circumstance happened at any place where our only representative was a resident and citizen of the country in which our citizens were injured. In other words, a citizen of their country would be representing our country in a matter in which we were deeply concerned and in which we ought to be represented by one of our own citizens. We have no diplomatic representatives in Canada except the consular agents. In their absence, as I have stated before, the clerks are in charge, and that is true in a large degree all over the world. From that point of view alone, we ought to have at every place and in every country American clerks in our consular offices.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, there being nobody else who wishes to discuss this important item, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin withdraws the pro forma amendment, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXPENSES OF INTERPRETERS, GUARDS, AND SO FORTH, IN TURKISH DOMINIONS AND SO FORTH.

Interpreters and guards at the consulates in the Turkish dominions, Persia, Morocco, northern Africa, and at Zanzibar, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State, \$30,000.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. I notice in a preceding item, on page 20, lines 20 to 24, inclusive, there are four places selected and an appropriation of \$48,700 made for interpreters to be employed in those consulates. On page 21, in the item the reading of which has just been completed by the Clerk, I notice there are five places so named. Why are those nine places selected especially and an appropriation made of \$78,700 for the two items? I am asking this purely for information.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It is necessary owing to the difficulty of the language at those places to have trained interpreters. The language is hard to learn, and it is difficult to get people who understand it thoroughly.

Mr. GOULDEN. And it applies to no other section of the world in which our consulates are located?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. No, sir.

Mr. GOULDEN. I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the words "and so forth," in line 1, and inserting after the word "interpreters," in line 1, the word "and."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 21, by striking out in line 1 the words "and so forth," and inserting after the word "interpreters" the word "and."

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman only strikes out the one "and so forth." There are two.

Mr. ROGERS. There is a reason for the second "and so forth," but I think there is no reason for the first.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MANN. What is the amendment?

Mr. STAFFORD. To strike out "and so forth," in the first line.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Division, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The text of the bill does not carry the words "and so forth."

Mr. ROGERS. You want the headlines to be in accordance with the text of the bill, do you not?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I want to give some idea of what is in it.

Mr. ROGERS. The bill itself says "interpreters and guards." What possible reason can there be for having in the headlines the words "interpreters, guards, and so forth"?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment has been rejected unless division is asked for.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 8, yeas 14.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOREIGN HOSPITAL AT CAPE TOWN.

Annual contribution toward the support of the Somerset Hospital (a foreign hospital), at Cape Town, \$50, to be paid by the Secretary of State upon the assurance that suffering seamen and citizens of the United States will be admitted to the privileges of said hospital.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman in reference to the preceding item of \$20,000 for the relief and protection of shipwrecked American seamen in certain territories. How much of that has been expended in the past, if the gentleman knows? I can not see how they spend that sum of money a year for this purpose.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The expenditure for the fiscal year 1914 was \$23,849—\$3,000 and something more than was appropriated.

Mr. MANN. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES, UNITED STATES CONSULATES.

Expenses of providing all such stationery, blanks, record and other books, seals, presses, flags, signs, rent (allowance for rent not to exceed in any case 30 per cent of the officer's salary), repairs to consular buildings owned by the United States, postage, furniture, including typewriters and exchange of same, statistics, newspapers, freight (foreign and domestic), telegrams, advertising, messenger service, traveling expenses of consular officers and consular assistants, compensation of Chinese writers, loss by exchange, and such other miscellaneous expenses as the President may think necessary for the several consulates and consular agencies in the transaction of their business, and payment in advance of subscriptions for newspapers (foreign and domestic) under this appropriation is hereby authorized, \$465,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I notice that we pay a very considerable sum of money at various of the embassies out of this item for contingent expenses. I suppose that is largely for rent. At Argentina, for the last fiscal year we paid out \$7,300 from this contingent fund; Chile, \$12,362; Germany, \$14,647; Japan, \$10,505; in Mexico, \$17,420; in Russia, \$15,387; Venezuela, \$11,924. Those are rather large sums of money to pay out of the contingent fund. I suppose that has been done for years. Is it mainly for rent?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It is for rent, but it is for other things, too, such as stationery and any expense of that character that arises at an embassy. But the gentleman will recall in the last appropriation bill the contingent expenses of the embassies was increased for the purpose of occasioning an equalization of these amounts at the European embassies.

Mr. MANN. These items I speak of, of course, were for the preceding year. They will be larger for this fiscal year.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The statement was made at that time that the Russian embassy got something like \$15,000 and the embassies at Berlin and Vienna got less, and the idea was to increase the appropriation so that our embassies in Russia, Germany, France, England, and probably Austria-Hungary, could have \$15,000 a year from this sum for the rent and general expenses of the embassies. Italy and Spain had \$10,000 a year. We increased it last year for the purpose of equalizing these embassies. I will say to the gentleman that a good part of that fund was used for rent.

Mr. MANN. Is that rent paid for consular offices or the embassy offices?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I was talking about the embassies.

Mr. MANN. That is what I thought. As a matter of fact, though, we make an allowance for embassies?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes; we do.

Mr. MANN. Of course, we have been told a thousand times here and elsewhere, and mainly elsewhere, that the salary paid to ambassadors is too small—and that may be true—because they are compelled to rent expensive quarters and pay the rent out of their own pockets, and that the Government makes no allowance for rent at all. As I understand it, we do make some allowance for rent.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. We certainly do. As I just stated, at some of the big embassies in Europe they get \$15,000—not all for rent, but for all the expenses.

Mr. STAFFORD. I move to strike out the last word. I wish to inquire if any part of this item is used for rent of embassies? As I understand it, this particular item is for consulates exclusively.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The gentleman is right.

Mr. STAFFORD. And there is a limitation in the paragraph that allows rent only in an amount not to exceed 30 per cent of the consul's salary?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes. But the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asked about the embassies during the discussion of this item.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman tell the committee how much of this appropriation is used for rent exclusively?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. One hundred and fifty-seven thousand dollars.

Mr. MANN. I can tell the gentleman how much was used in the last fiscal year. It was \$77,729.57 for rent of offices.

Mr. STAFFORD. If there is only \$77,000 used, that would leave about \$388,000 available for these miscellaneous expenses.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. One hundred and fifty-seven thousand dollars was used for rent.

Mr. MANN. Well, as reported by the State Department on page 17 of the report on the expenditure of this item, they have "rent of offices" set down as \$77,729.50.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. From what does the gentleman read?

Mr. MANN. Page 17.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Appropriations and expenditures of the Department of State, page 17?

Mr. MANN. I was reading from contingent expenses for foreign missions. This is for contingent expenses of consulates?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes; and that is \$157,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then there would be available over twice the amount for contingent expenses. Can the gentleman inform me generally as to how that is used?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Well, for all sorts of expenses around embassies—water and ice, flag, uniform, repairs to furniture and fixtures, repairs to building, books; miscellaneous expenses that arise in connection with the consulates; and taxes, stamps, stationery, and so forth.

Mr. STAFFORD. What do they total?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The taxes?

Mr. STAFFORD. No; I mean all these miscellaneous items that have just been enumerated.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Three hundred and seventy-nine thousand three hundred and forty dollars in 1913.

Mr. STAFFORD. That includes the \$157,000 for rent?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes; and in 1914 the total was \$455,865.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was trying to ascertain the amount that was expended for these miscellaneous items, exclusive of rent.

Mr. MANN. I will furnish the gentleman with the total that I have got here.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. One hundred and fifty-seven thousand dollars was taken from \$379,000, leaving \$227,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. That furnishes the information I was desirous of obtaining.

Mr. MANN. The largest item was cablegrams, and so forth, which was \$42,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Purchase and repairs, consular premises: For the acquisition of suitable premises or for the purchase of land and the erection thereon of a suitable building or of buildings in which to house the consulate general, the United States court, the jail, the post office, and other offices of the United States at Shanghai, China, including all necessary repairs, \$360,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph, and at the request of the chairman I ask that it be passed over for the time being. I want to be heard on it later.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] reserves a point of order on the paragraph, and asks unanimous consent that it be passed over for the time being. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NINETEENTH CONFERENCE, INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION.

The appropriation of \$40,000 "For the purpose of defraying the expenses in Washington City incident to the Nineteenth Conference of the Interparliamentary Union, to be held in Washington in 1915, to be expended under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe. The President is hereby requested to extend an invitation to the members of the Interparliamentary Union," made in the "Act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915," is hereby extended and made available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia and Mr. MOORE rose.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman from Virginia wish to offer an amendment?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. I merely wanted to inquire, in the event of no meeting being held in 1915, in view of the European war conditions, what the effect of this appropriation would be?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. If no conference could be started in the calendar year 1915, I understand from the Department of State that this money would not lapse into the Treasury on the 1st of July, 1915, because this conference can be held at any time during the calendar year 1916.

Mr. MOORE. Is it the idea to extend this appropriation so that it may be available for 1916 if the convention should be held then?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes. I will say to the gentleman that I conferred with the officials of the State Department with reference to it, and they thought it would be available anyhow.

Mr. MOORE. They thought it would be available in 1916?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes; because it does not revert to the Treasury on the 1st of July.

Mr. MOORE. A number of international conferences or conventions of one kind and another called for 1914 and 1915 undoubtedly will not be held. I know of one or two that have been called off, and I assume that, unless there is a cessation of hostilities on the other side, this one also would be called off, because it would be impossible for the belligerent nations to participate.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. This is extended to July 1, 1916.

Mr. MOORE. That is done because it is thought that possibly the convention may be held?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 25, line 23, after the word "prescribe," by striking out the period and the words "The President is hereby requested to extend an invitation to the members of the Interparliamentary Union" and inserting in lieu thereof a comma, and on page 26, line 6, at the end of the paragraph, insert the words "The President is hereby requested to extend an invitation to the members of the Interparliamentary Union."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, that amendment brings up the question that I had in mind a little while ago. Is it the idea of the gentleman that the President should invite members of the Interparliamentary Union, notwithstanding the conditions that prevail abroad now?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Oh, no. It is only in the event the President should see fit to extend the invitation.

Mr. MOORE. I think it is fair that the gentleman should know of at least one instance that has come to my knowledge. I happen to be very familiar with one of these international congresses. Only during the last month has word come out of Brussels, for instance—and I suppose there are other headquarters for these international bodies abroad—that absolutely nothing could be done, because the papers of the congress had been seized and were under the control of a belligerent power not friendly to the headquarters country. Therefore it would seem to be almost an absurdity for the President of the United States to extend invitations where countries are under the war control of other countries and would be in no position to respond to the invitation.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Of course, he would not do that.

Mr. MOORE. I would not want to put him in the position of doing what would appear to be an absurd thing.

Mr. MANN. This simply extends the authority that he now has. It is in the present law.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. That is all.

Mr. MANN. That provision is in the existing law.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It was intended that the Interparliamentary Union should meet last fall, but on account of

the distressing conditions in Europe the President did not extend the invitation. This just gives him the authority that he already has.

Mr. MOORE. I thought there was some obligation imposed on the President.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Oh, no.

Mr. MOORE. I think he ought to have discretion to do the sensible thing, under the circumstances.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. He has.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania feel that it would embarrass the President to extend this invitation?

Mr. MOORE. Not so much that as that we are imposing upon the President the obligation to invite people to come here when they are helpless and unable even to receive their invitations.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The duty imposed upon the President must be understood from the context, and the context is that the President is "requested" to extend an invitation.

Mr. MOORE. He is not obligated to do it?

Mr. MONTAGUE. He should simply be "authorized" to do it.

Mr. MOORE. Then that would leave him discretion.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes; that would leave him discretion.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

FIFTH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN STATES.

The appropriation of \$75,000 "To meet the actual and necessary expenses of the delegates of the United States to the Fifth International Conference of American States, to be held at the city of Santiago, Chile, beginning in September, 1914, and of their clerical assistants, to be expended in the discretion of the Secretary of State," made in the "Act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915," is hereby extended and made available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. What was the reason for postponing this congress?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The reason was that in this instance the Chilean Government was not ready to hold the conference at that time.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. BOOHER having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Carr, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 7091. An act to create an additional judge in the district of New Jersey; and

S. J. Res. 205. Joint resolution to convey the thanks of Congress to Capt. Thomas Moore, master of the Alaska Steamship Co.'s steamer *Cordova*, and to the officers and crew, for the prompt and heroic service rendered by them in rescuing 58 survivors of the U. S. revenue cutter *Tahoma*.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

FIFTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS AGAINST ALCOHOLISM.

The appropriation of \$40,000 "For the purpose of defraying the expenses incident to the Fifteenth International Congress Against Alcoholism, to be held in the United States in 1915, to be expended under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe; the Secretary of State is hereby authorized and requested to extend an invitation to the Governments of the world with which we maintain diplomatic relations to participate in and appoint delegates to said congress: *Provided*, That an itemized account of all expenditures shall be reported to Congress," made in the "act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915," is hereby extended and made available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the same error exists in this paragraph that existed in the previous paragraph, that the gentleman has just corrected.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk, the same amendment that I offered to the other paragraph.

Mr. MANN. It would not be the same amendment. It is to strike out all of line 25 on page 26, and down to and including the word "congress," in line 5 on page 27, and then insert that language at the end of line 9.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out all of line 25, page 26, and down to and including the word "congress," in line 5 on page 27, and insert, at the end of line 9, the words "The Secretary of State is hereby authorized and requested to extend an invitation to the Governments of the world with which we maintain diplomatic relations to participate in and appoint delegates to said congress: *Provided*, That an itemized account of all expenditures shall be reported to Congress."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a new paragraph to come in after line 9.

Mr. MANN. To come in after the amendment just agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend on page 27 by inserting after the amendment just agreed to the following:

"That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and requested to invite the several Governments of the Republics of Mexico, Central and South America, Haiti, and Santo Domingo to send official delegates to the meeting of the Pan American Medical Congress to be held in the city of San Francisco, Cal., Panama-Pacific International Exposition, June 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21, anno Domini 1915."

Mr. MANN. I reserve a point of order, at least until you strike out "anno Domini."

Mr. FOSTER. I agree with my colleague on that. I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment by striking out the words "anno Domini."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that modification will be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. I reserve a point of order on the amendment, anyhow. I did not understand just what countries the amendment covers.

Mr. FOSTER. It covers the South American countries, including, of course, Mexico. I do not know whether he could now extend an invitation to Mexico or not.

Mr. MANN. Does it cover the South American countries? Let us hear it read.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent to have it reported again.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. MANN. I still reserve the point of order. Is there to be any expense?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I shall not ask that there be any expense.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserve the point of order. I should like to inquire whether this includes an invitation to the Government of Cuba.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I am glad the gentleman has asked that question. I was about to ask it.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it does.

Mr. STAFFORD. Cuba should certainly be included.

Mr. MOORE. Why not the other West Indian Islands?

Mr. FOSTER. I think Cuba ought to go in. The Pan American Union was organized some years ago. We did invite these Latin-American Republics to form the Pan American Union, which was done about 1892, and Congress passed a bill inviting them to come to this country and form this union.

Mr. STAFFORD. In that Congress was Canada included?

Mr. FOSTER. I think not.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does not the gentleman believe that owing to our close relations with our neighbor on the north we should invite Canada as well?

Mr. MANN. This congress is to consider those diseases which float into us from the torrid countries.

Mr. FOSTER. As my colleague says, this congress is with reference to the diseases that come from the south from the torrid countries.

Mr. STAFFORD. That information would be as valuable to the Dominion Government as to ourselves.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; but the Pan American Union comprises those countries to the south, and the congress is to consider the diseases that come from those countries.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand that the gentleman has no objection to including Cuba in the list.

Mr. FOSTER. No. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment by including Cuba.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment so as to include Cuba. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of the point of order.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, one reason that there has been no invitation to the Dominion of Canada is that this invitation was addressed to the sovereignties, only to those independent Governments. It is true that the British have some tropical concessions down there like Jamaica and British Honduras.

Mr. STAFFORD. And British Guiana.

Mr. KAHN. But they are not in the Pan American Union.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman from Illinois, to whom the President would direct an invitation, to the Republic of Mexico.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know, although this includes the Republic of Mexico; I do not know whether there could be an invitation extended to it or not.

Mr. MOORE. As a matter of etiquette I would like to know whether the invitation would go to Carranza or Villa or Zapata?

Mr. FOSTER. If they were going to invite all the governments it would, but I can not tell the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE. We have some communications which are to be addressed to Mexico anyhow, and I would like to know how it is done.

Mr. SLAYDEN. It would be easy enough; send five invitations.

Mr. MOORE. I observe that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois says "republics of Mexico"; it speaks of governments in the plural.

Mr. FOSTER. It says "republics of Mexico" and then goes on with the names of the other republics, so they are all included, and this does not mean "republics of Mexico."

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman interprets his language to mean only one Republic of Mexico?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; I have said that I do not know whether we could extend any invitation to Mexico or not; it might be that by that time conditions would be altogether different.

Mr. MOORE. The President was insistent on refusing to confer with Huerta. This should be known before any point of order is raised. I do not want to make the point of order to bar out a friendly country, but how is Mexico to be invited?

Mr. FOSTER. I will say that I can not give the gentleman the information that he asks for.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman regards it more a matter of law than of etiquette.

Mr. FOSTER. That would be determined by the President and the State Department.

Mr. MOORE. It would be left with the State Department?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. And we could fall back upon the Secretary of State to advise us in the emergency?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does the gentleman think it would be a proper thing to withhold an invitation from the Republic of Mexico?

Mr. MOORE. Not at all. I think that the invitation should be extended if it is possible to give it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Would there be any harm in having the invitation potential, so that we might use it if the occasion should arise?

Mr. MOORE. I recognize that the gentleman from Virginia is an authority on matters of etiquette, and since the gentleman from Illinois has not been able to answer my question, I appeal to my Chesterfieldian friend from Virginia to say just how and to whom the invitation should be extended for the Republic of Mexico.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I understood the invitation to be to the Latin-American Republics, including, of course, Mexico. The word "Republics" applies or includes Mexico and the other countries of South America.

Mr. MOORE. At any rate, in the last analysis we could fall back on the Secretary of State to interpret this delicate situation.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no doubt that the Secretary of State would meet the situation.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the question that the gentleman from Pennsylvania asked my colleague from Illinois might have produced a dangerous answer if my colleague had not been cautious and accurate, as he always is. I asked the same question the other day, in the consideration of the sundry civil bill, on an item making an appropriation in reference to the Imperial Valley of the Colorado River, and several gentlemen informed me without any hesitation at all that we would have no trouble in dealing with the home government in Mexico; that we had obtained authority and that we had been doing the work; and, as a matter of fact, some gentleman said we had dealt with Villa or his man. Then, I picked up the report of our Government, made by the officer in charge of the work down there, and found that he said because there was no government in Mexico with which they could deal they had done nothing. I wondered whether the information which is often furnished on the floor on the spur of the moment to relieve somebody who wants information is reliable, because this time I got "accurate" information which undoubtedly was entirely imaginary.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin insist on his point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, I withdrew the point of order several minutes ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXPOSITION IN CITY OF PANAMA.

That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to accept an invitation extended by the Government of Panama to the Government of the United States to participate in an exposition to be held in the city of Panama; and the sum of \$100,000 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to enable suitable participation in said exposition by this country, \$75,000 of which, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be expended for the erection, on land donated to this Government by the Government of Panama, of a suitable building, which may permanently stand as a bureau of information and commercial museum to exhibit and draw attention at all times to the industrial and commercial standing of the United States, and the residue to be expended for an appropriate exhibit of the arts, industries, manufactures, products of the soil and the mines of the United States, and, as far as practicable, of the functions of the General Government, and an exhibit of such other articles as the President may direct, including an exhibit relating to the Panama Canal.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order. As I understand this proposition, a year ago last November or December the Republic of Panama transmitted an invitation to the United States to take part in this exposition, which was to be held in Panama last November or December. That matter rested with the Department of State for five or six months, or thereabouts, and then they sent a letter, and it was sent to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, where it again reclined on an easy sofa for several months. In August or September, or thereabouts, this resolution was reported to the House with a favorable recommendation. It was not acted upon. In fact, there was not time within which to construct the building. The exposition has been put off until, I think, April. Is that right?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I think it is later than that.

Mr. MANN. It may have been again postponed.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I think it is July.

Mr. MANN. When I was in Panama in November last it had been postponed, I think, until April. This exposition, as the gentleman knows, is to be located on grounds out where they want to make a new portion of the city for residence purposes, and it is some distance from the city of Panama—not a great ways—but at a place where a permanent exhibit building for the United States would be just about as valuable as it would be at the bottom of the sea. If we have a Government building down there in connection with the Panama Canal, it seems to me it ought to be easily accessible to the canal and not located out of town.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The information the committee had was that this land was about the most desirable location around Panama city.

Mr. MANN. Oh, it is a very pleasant location for an exposition. It is not in a part of the city of Panama at present, but it is out of the city, at a point where they wish to develop it.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Then it will probably be a future city?

Mr. MANN. Some people may live out there. That is very likely; but it is quite a ways from the canal. The Panama Canal lies on one side of the city of Panama, and this exposition site is away out on the other side of the city of Panama. A permanent exposition building there, so far as we are concerned, would not be worth anything at all.

If we are to have a Government exhibit there, and I do not know but that we will need one, it ought to be easily accessible to the canal and on the Canal Zone, and not located where we have no control over it at all in a portion of the city where no one will go as a rule without considerable trouble. I doubt very much whether it is possible—I know it is not possible to construct an exposition building after the 4th of March in time for the exposition if it is held at the time it is expected it will be held. It has been postponed, and it may be again postponed. There is nothing there but an exposition building, a very good looking building. It is possible that Spain has put up something of a building there. I am perfectly willing, of course, to have our Government make any sort of an exhibit that is proper at an exposition that the Republic of Panama holds, no matter what is the reason for holding it, but for us to put up a permanent building, and that is the only excuse offered by the Department of State for this item, for United States exhibits at a place where people will not go, instead of putting it alongside the canal on the Canal Zone, seems to me to be the height of folly.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. What distance is it from the city of Panama, or Balboa, which adjoins Panama?

Mr. MANN. Of course they join, but it is 2 or 3 miles from the canal.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. On the opposite side?

Mr. MANN. On the opposite side from where the exposition is to be held.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. And there is no town whatever over there where the exposition is to be held?

Mr. MANN. There is no town there now. It is a very pretty part of the surrounding country. There is an effort being made, so I was informed, to develop it as suburban property and get the people to go out there to live.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Where is it located in respect to the Miraflores Lake or Dam?

Mr. MANN. I could not give the gentleman the points of the compass, but it is practically opposite from Balboa.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has stated the situation correctly. This bill was reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs by the gentleman who now occupies the chair last August. It was thought that the exposition would be held last fall. Since then it has been postponed from time to time, and my understanding is it is to be held in July. The purpose of the appropriation is to have \$25,000 available for participation in the exposition, and \$75,000 with which to put up a permanent building upon the exposition grounds, upon land that is deemed most desirable for a building of this character, and in a part of the country that it is thought will in the near future build up into a residence part of the city of Panama. I desire to read in this connection a letter which I recently received from the Secretary of State in reference to the matter:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 20, 1915.

MY DEAR MR. FLOOD: I have made inquiries in regard to the Panama Exposition, about which you spoke to me a few days ago, and find that the exposition is to open on July 6, 1915. Its character is to be Latin American and its purpose is to bring under one organization a series of permanent exhibits of products from Latin-American countries so that travelers crossing the Isthmus may have an opportunity to inspect with a minimum of difficulty and expense the products of the various countries of Latin America.

The only exception to the purely Latin-American character of the exposition is the inclusion of Spain as an exhibitor. It is expected that Spain will spend some \$80,000 for the erection of a permanent building which, after the close of the exposition, will be used to house the legation and will contain a permanent exhibition of Spanish products and be the center of Spanish trade publicity in the Caribbean region.

It is understood that Cuba and Venezuela will also erect permanent buildings at the exposition. Cuba intends to spend about \$80,000 for a building, which will later on become the home of the Cuban Legation and contain a permanent exhibit of Cuban products. It is not known how much will be expended by Venezuela.

It is understood that Guatemala will spend perhaps \$25,000 on her exhibit, and Nicaragua, and probably other Latin-American countries, will be represented by displays of merchandise and other articles of their production.

Panama itself has already expended about \$650,000 on a permanent exhibit and upon buildings now under construction, which will be used in the future as Government offices.

The distinct Pan American character of the exposition makes it of the highest importance that the United States should take a conspicuous part in the exposition. It is obvious that a permanent exhibit of the United States on the Isthmus of Panama, which will be crossed by so many passengers interested in trade in the near future, could not fail to stimulate interest in articles of American production, and the appropriation for American participation should be ample for the installation of a thoroughly comprehensive display of articles produced in the United States.

In view of the character of the exposition it would seem desirable that as much latitude as practicable be given to the expenditure of the money appropriated for the purpose, and I would suggest that if there should be no objection on the part of Congress the appropriation be made without limitation to any particular year, so that it may be expended during the entire period of the exposition, which conceivably may extend beyond the calendar year of 1915.

I am, my dear Mr. Flood,

Very sincerely, yours,

W. J. BRYAN.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman will notice that in the letter most of the items say that they expect that this or that country will do this and that. Now, this exposition was to have been held last November or December. Then it was postponed until April or May. Now, it is again postponed until July. They still say that they expect that this country or that will erect a building and make an exhibit. There never will be an exposition held there, so far as that is concerned, that amounts to anything. There is nothing there, and it is no place at all for a permanent building unless you want to build a legation building down there, which is another proposition. I do not know but what it would be suitable for a summer home or a winter home or a country residence for an American legation. It is no place for an exposition. I went over the ground and looked at it very carefully when I was there, because I knew of this bill; but no American who goes down there would recommend this place. Of course, very naturally people here representing Panama are

very anxious to have this Government participate for reasons which I am not going into.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I will.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think the gentleman is entirely correct, if an exposition building is to be placed at the point the gentleman indicates. I think it should be in Balboa.

Mr. MANN. I went over there and looked at it.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think if it would be at Balboa it would be in a better location.

Mr. MOORE. Is it on the road to old Panama?

Mr. MANN. I think it is out in that direction.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Does the gentleman make the point of order against this item?

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. MANN. I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. May I ask a question before the gentleman from Pennsylvania begins? I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question, if he will yield.

Mr. MANN. Surely.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I would like to ask the gentleman if he would make a point of order against the item that carried an appropriation for \$25,000?

Mr. MANN. I would not.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, in view of what has been said by the two distinguished gentlemen who have been carrying on this discussion [Mr. MANN of Illinois and Mr. FLOOD of Virginia], I think probably the adoption of the suggestion that \$25,000 be expended to enable the United States to participate in the Panama Exposition would be sufficient for the present. It would be manifestly impossible to erect a building and set up an adequate permanent exposition of American products for the \$100,000 mentioned in the bill. For many years I have believed that something ought to be done in the way of a permanent building for an exhibit of American products to promote trade in South American and other countries through the medium of the Panama Canal, and I regret that up to date no definite steps in that direction have been taken.

During the discussion of the Panama Canal government bill a great deal was said about the purpose of the canal. A majority of the House held at that time that the canal was constructed more for military than for commercial purposes. I did not fully subscribe to the military idea. From the beginning of the Panama Canal agitation I have believed that if the canal was to be of any advantage to the United States at all it would not be in keeping a chip on our shoulder and inviting other nations to knock it off, but, in addition to saving the long and dangerous voyages around South America, it would broaden and promote our commercial relations with South American countries, which relations have long been neglected. Mr. Chairman, before the unhappy conflict that now prevails up the trade of these Latin-American countries. It was a matter of great interest and concern to American merchants and manufacturers. The large commercial interests of the United States approved our undertaking at Panama, believing the business and industries of our own country would be the first to obtain advantage from the construction of the canal, and that it would inaugurate closer and friendlier relations with the South American Republics.

In 1911 there was considerable discussion of the methods by which the benefits of the canal were to be reaped by the people of the United States. Expositions were proposed for San Francisco and New Orleans, but neither of these were to be permanent, although, as in the case of the great Centennial Exposition at Philadelphia in 1876, some memorial will doubtless remain of the stupendous San Francisco Exposition which is being opened by the President to-day. Having the permanence of our Panama Canal advantages in mind, I introduced a bill in February, 1911, to celebrate the opening of the Panama Canal by establishing a great national headquarters of commerce and industry in the city of Washington, the Capital of the Nation.

For information, I insert that bill at this time:

A bill (H. R. 32536) to celebrate the completion of the Panama Canal by the establishment of a permanent memorial to commerce and industry.

Be it enacted, etc., That there be, and is hereby, created and dedicated to commerce and industry a national trade bureau, which shall be a permanent memorial of the completion of the Panama Canal, as authorized by the act of June 28, 1902, and of the intent of the Government to foster, promote, and develop the foreign and domestic commerce, as contemplated by the act of February 14, 1903, creating the Department of Commerce and Labor. The national trade bureau shall be organized and established in the city of Washington, D. C., under the supervision and control of a board of trustees, to consist of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Commerce

and Labor, severally, ex officio. The board of trustees is hereby authorized and directed to select and purchase land and erect thereon a building or buildings in the city of Washington of sufficient proportions to install a complete collection of sample products of the soil, the forests, the mines, and the sea as grown, manufactured, improved, or prepared for commercial use by human labor or ingenuity in the United States of America or in any foreign country with which the people of the United States may have commercial or industrial relations now or hereafter, and illustrative of the methods and opportunities of creating and distributing wealth. The board of trustees shall further organize and establish a thorough system of acquiring and imparting to the people information of every kind upon commercial and industrial questions at home and abroad, and, for the purpose of making more effective this work, shall consolidate in the national trade bureau such existing bureaus charged by law with the collection and dissemination of statistical information as may be appropriate thereto.

SEC. 2. That it shall be the duty of the board of trustees, provided for in section 1 of this act, to time the completion and opening of the national trade bureau to correspond with the formal opening of the Panama Canal and to arrange for such ceremonies at the opening of said bureau as shall include the participation of accredited representatives of the various nations of the world with whom the United States entertains or may hereafter entertain friendly trade relations. Such ceremonies shall be continued for a period not exceeding three months, during which the bureau, under such regulations as the board of trustees may provide, shall be open to public inspection and to such meetings and conferences of trade and commercial bodies of this and foreign countries as may avail themselves of the opportunity to meet or confer therein. At the expiration of the ceremonial period of three months the board of trustees shall cease to exist and the supervision and control of the bureau shall devolve upon the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor in such manner as shall be defined by law.

SEC. 3. That the limit of cost to enable the board of trustees to give effect to and execute the provisions of sections 1 and 2 of this act shall be the sum of \$2,500,000.

Of course I had in mind the establishment at Washington or at any other point that might be agreed upon, at a cost of \$2,500,000, more or less, of such a memorial institution as would prove a Mecca, not only for people of the United States who are interested in trade and commerce, but of visiting foreigners who might be induced to trade with us. This country does not now have any such institution; and my thought at the time was that since most visiting foreigners come to Washington, it might be appropriate to set up this great American information bureau at the Capital. The bill attracted much attention from commercial bodies throughout the country, but as Congress decided to approve the Panama Canal Exposition at San Francisco, the permanent institution proposition had very little chance in that Congress. Later on, in June, 1912, when the question of fortifications was up and Congress was considering a bill for that purpose, I offered the following amendment:

And the President is also authorized and directed to create a commission, to consist of one member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, three members of the National Chamber of Commerce, and the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor, to inquire into and report upon the most approved ways and means of utilizing the Panama Canal and the territory adjacent thereto within the Canal Zone, to foster, promote, and develop the mining, manufacturing, shipping, and fisheries industries, the labor interests, and transportation facilities of the United States, and to provide for the commerce and industry of the United States a fair and full return upon the investment made by the United States in the construction of the canal. For the purposes hereof the President is empowered to use so much as may be necessary of the moneys appropriated by this act from the departments of civil administration and law.

The purpose of this amendment was to obtain some recognition, if possible, for the commercial interests through the Department of Commerce and Labor, but it was objected to and ruled out by the Chair.

Subsequently, in support of this general idea, I said:

Now, Mr. Chairman, in view of the contemplated coordination of the canal and commerce, it would seem as if we ought to provide in some way for the business man who wants to do business on or through the canal. It is patent to anyone who visits the zone and stops overnight at the Tivoli Hotel that foreign nations have their representatives on the ground. It is obvious also that, so far as they have been able to do so, they have made Panama a basis for operations in the contest for the commerce of South America. We are already buying extensively from those foreign agents ourselves.

To what extent have we encouraged American business interests to make business by or through the canal? We know that Germany and Great Britain are already entrenched in the countries south of Panama and that they have been more successful in making friends with the 60,000,000 of people there than we have. What warehouse facilities have we offered Americans? What banking factors or means of exchange? What opportunities to study the language and customs of South Americans or to show our samples? I do not insist that it is the business of the Government to do all these things for the individual business man, but I do believe that by our decision to make the zone a military reservation we are helping to shut the door in his face.

The fortification of the canal having been provided for, without regard to the commercial advantages that might be acquired through our control of the Canal Zone, I introduced another bill, hoping it might be considered, apart from both the San Francisco Exposition, which must necessarily be temporary, and also the fortifications question. This bill contemplated a Panama Canal trade commission to investigate and report upon the possibilities of the canal as a commercial feeder. It was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has not yet seen fit to act upon it. It is also a fact that

many commercial bodies expressed their approval of this bill and urged that something be done on the lines suggested. The bill was as follows:

A bill (H. R. 25779) creating a Panama Canal trade commission, and to enable the commercial, agricultural, and industrial interests of the United States to derive advantages from the Panama Canal.

Be it enacted, etc., That a commission to be known as the Panama Canal trade commission, to consist of the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor, the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, and five representative citizens, members of commercial or industrial organizations of the United States, no two of whom shall be residents of the same State, shall be appointed by the President to inquire into and report upon the possibilities and advantages of the Panama Canal and the territory adjacent thereto within the Panama Zone for the fostering, promotion, and development in Central and South America and in other countries of the commerce and industry of the United States.

SEC. 2. That it shall be the duty of the Panama Canal trade commission, created in the foregoing section of this act, to report from time to time to the President as to the advantages to be derived by the farmers, the merchants, and the manufacturers of the United States, and by all citizens having to do with the raw or finished products of the soil, the forests, the mines, or the waters of the United States, to the end that the vast expenditures made by the United States in the construction and maintenance of the Panama Canal and the United States territory adjacent thereto may be of advantage and benefit to the people of the United States. And for the information of the people of the United States the said commission shall include in its report to the President all available data as to the use made of the Panama Canal and adjacent territory, including the cities of Panama and Colon, by foreign nations engaged in commercial transactions with Central and South America, in which, by or through the Panama Canal and adjacent United States territory, the commercial relations of the United States might be strengthened and improved.

SEC. 3. That the members of the Panama Canal trade commission, excepting the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor and the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, shall receive for their services \$1,000 per annum each; that necessary traveling expenses on official business incident to the work of the commission shall be paid to all the members of the commission, and that the commission may employ such expert and clerical assistance as may be necessary to carry on the work provided for in this act.

SEC. 4. That the limit of cost to enable the Panama Canal trade commission to give effect to and to execute the provisions of the foregoing sections of this act shall be the sum of \$50,000.

With this hurried statement of well-intentioned efforts to direct public attention to the desirability of acquiring something from the people of the United States in return for their vast expenditure upon the canal, I am naturally pleased to note that the Secretary of State, in his letter to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood], under date of January 20, 1915, approves the idea of a permanent exhibit in connection with the approaching exposition of the Government of Panama at Panama City. It indicates that we are gradually coming round to the suggestion of a permanent exposition for the display of American products and wares, no matter whether it is held in Washington, in San Francisco, in New York, or on the Isthmus. Some day it may be found that such a plan as was outlined in my bill of February, 1911, will contribute very largely to our own prosperity and to the peace of nations. We may not yet be ready for it on so large a scale. We certainly could not accomplish it with the appropriations proposed in this bill, nor at the remote location from Panama City which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mann] indicates is to be the scene of the Government of Panama activities.

We could not erect for \$100,000, as proposed in this bill, any such building for exhibition purposes as would be commensurate with the display we should make of our manufactures and farm products, nor would the \$25,000 suggested for exhibits only begin to meet the situation. The permanent exposition that ought to be established somewhere as a memorial of the Panama Canal, which is our international trade promoter, should have all the facilities of an international trade bureau as well as floor space for American samples and the vast quantity of exhibits that would come up from the factories and farms as well as from the mines and the seas. We should be able to give the manufacturer in Detroit as much information about trade conditions in Ceylon as the intending Ceylon purchaser would desire to have about the industries of Detroit. There should be the most complete and up-to-date information on rates, tariffs, banking customs, and methods of transportation, and we should provide along with our greatest show place the most accurate and detailed information that we had reason to believe might come to us upon the creation of the Department of Commerce and Labor in 1903. The province of that department as set forth in the act was:

To foster, promote, and develop the foreign and domestic commerce, the mining, manufacturing, shipping, and fishery industries, the labor interests, and the transportation facilities of the United States.

And it is high time the American business men and producers were getting the full benefit of this splendid program.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I will.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not believe that one active, well-trained, thoroughly intelli-

gent commercial traveler would do more good in the way of getting trade than an exposition on the Isthmus, even at the expense of \$100,000?

Mr. MOORE. No; I would not go that far. One thoroughly trained commercial traveler could do a splendid business for his particular concern. If he should go out to sell American hats or shoes, he could drum up a special trade, but that would be for one concern; it would not have that broad and nationwide interest we would like to see taken in an enterprise of this kind.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Does not the gentleman believe that the various productive enterprises will have their representatives there, or salesmen, soliciting trade and getting it?

Mr. MOORE. Well, my experience as a result of two visits to the canal taught me something with respect to the trade activities of the United States. I noticed very particularly that the representatives of foreign nations were there. I observed that the German representatives were on the Canal Zone, that the French representatives were there, that the British representatives were there, but I saw very few representatives of the United States, or seeking to promote American trade.

Most of the Americans on the canal were sightseers, or were there because they were being paid by the United States to do some work in connection with the canal. They were not taking advantage of the trade opportunities that might come from mixing up with the nationalities that were on the canal, or otherwise ingratiating themselves and the things they had to sell into the confidence of foreigners.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman, with his permission, another question or two. I want to get at the facts. Does not the gentleman believe that those representatives of English, German, and other European commercial houses who were on the Isthmus of Panama were not there to meet the casual visitor or traveler crossing the Isthmus, but were there to sell goods to the merchants residing on the Isthmus at Panama or Colon, or wherever it is?

Mr. MOORE. If their objective was to do business only on the Isthmus of Panama, that might be true. But I presume that was only an incident of their being there. They were coming up from and going back to Ecuador and Chile and Argentina. They were there doing business generally. Panama is a central point and an international meeting place, and I suppose these foreigners were improving upon their opportunities there. The truth is that many of them have become well established in the South American markets, which up to the present time the United States has not attempted to do as it should.

Mr. SLAYDEN. If the gentleman will bear with me, the point I want to make is this: They have gotten themselves well established in the South American trade and Central American trade because they went to the places where the merchants reside. They went to the people where the customers were, and not stopping at a central point and trying to do business through anticipation. The way they do business is to go and visit the various countries and present their goods and their prices?

Mr. MOORE. That may be true wherever they go out specifically for a specific kind of business. They may have produced results, and no doubt they did. They understood the language; they understood Spanish, which the average American traveler does not. They made themselves understood by the people, and they remained in the territory long enough to get the confidence of the people, which the American hustler will not usually wait to do.

The Yankee traveler goes there and does not remain long enough to get acquainted with the trade customs, banking, and so forth. We expected to improve upon these conditions when the Department of Commerce was founded in 1903. Its special function was to be to develop American trade at home and abroad. Here at Panama was the greatest American enterprise ever attempted, and not a dollar spent in any way to help ourselves commercially, and commerce includes mechanics and labor in the United States.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I will.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I desire to ask the gentleman what has been the success of the Philadelphia exposition, for which he has had appropriations for many years?

Mr. MOORE. To which exposition does the gentleman refer?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The permanent exhibit that was established many years ago.

Mr. MOORE. If the gentleman refers to the Commercial Museum, I would inform him that it receives no appropriations from the Government. It is maintained by its members and by small appropriations received from the city of Philadelphia and the State of Pennsylvania. It does not receive anything from the United States at all.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. But it did at one time.

Mr. MOORE. It did receive an appropriation when the international exhibits were being brought in and when nations were being invited to conference and a great deal was being done to improve our relations, particularly with the Latin-American countries. The record in connection with that institution is a proud one, and although it serves the people generally, the Government saw fit to shut it off from appropriations.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. And what have been the results of the museum?

Mr. MOORE. The results have been excellent. So much so that at the exposition building, where information is available in respect to raw materials, tariffs, and so forth, of all countries, when free lectures are given there is not room to accommodate the people who come daily wishing to acquire information in regard to international trade. It is a valuable information bureau for business men desiring to expand their connections and for foreigners seeking to know about American conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask the privilege of proceeding for five minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes a point of order against this paragraph.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in lieu of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will send his amendment to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. My amendment proposes, Mr. Chairman, to strike out of the item—

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 27, line 15—

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. That is not what I want. If the Clerk will take the bill, I will indicate. I want to strike out all the item on line 18—

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman that he ask leave to return to this place later.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It will take but a minute.

Mr. MANN. So that he can have his amendment prepared.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It will take just a minute. Strike out, on line 18, beginning with the figures "\$75,000," down to and including the words "to be expended" in line 24. And the rest of it is the amendment I offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 27, by striking out—

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. And, on line 15, strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$25,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will suggest to the gentleman that he reduce his amendment to writing.

Mr. MANN. Ask leave to return to the paragraph.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The Clerk has it there now, if the Chair will permit him to read it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment. The Chair wishes to say that you can not amend the paragraph. It has been stricken out on a point of order.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I am not trying to amend the paragraph. I am offering an amendment in lieu of the paragraph, which I ask the Clerk to read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On line 15, page 27, strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$25,000"; and on the same page, line 18, strike out all after the word "country" down to and including the word "expended," in line 24.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, let the Clerk read the rest of the paragraph. That is not my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an appropriate exhibit of the arts, industries, manufactures, products of the soil and mines of the United States, and, as far as practicable, of the functions of the General Government, and an exhibit of such other articles as the President may direct, including an exhibit relating to the Panama Canal.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. That is not my amendment. The Clerk should begin on 11.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman had better adopt my suggestion.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I adopt the gentleman's suggestion and ask unanimous consent to pass over that item for the present and return to it later.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the paragraph will be passed over and returned to later.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the President is hereby requested to take such steps as he may deem necessary to have the Republic of Cuba reimburse the United States to the extent of \$6,509,511.26, said sum being the amount expended out of the Treasury of the United States from 1907 to 1909 on account of the army of pacification in Cuba.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] makes a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it is clearly subject to a point of order. It is legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] want to be heard on that?

Mr. McKENZIE. No. I do not care to be heard on it. It is too important a matter to be put through on a bill of this character. Therefore I make the point of order.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, it is an item requesting the President of the United States to take such steps as he may deem necessary to have the Republic of Cuba reimburse the United States to the extent of \$6,509,511.26, which this Government expended in Cuba for the benefit of Cuba.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman does not maintain that this is not legislation, does he?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I have not gotten to that point.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that in 1906, during the disturbed conditions in the island of Cuba, our Government established a provisional government in Cuba, and the Hon. William H. Taft, who was then Secretary of War, acting under instructions of the President, proclaimed, on September 29, 1906, this provisional government. They did it with the assurance to the Government of Cuba that it would be temporary. It was temporary, but it established peace and order there, and in doing so there was expended out of the Treasury of the United States the sum of \$6,509,511.26, with the understanding that the Cuban Government would reimburse this Government for that amount of money.

This is simply a request to the President to take steps to collect that amount, which he will do if the Cuban Government is able to pay it. If the Cuban Government is not able to pay it, he will not do it. Our bill carries \$4,400,000, and this sum is more than \$2,000,000 in excess of the entire amount which the bill carries. The Cuban Government owes it to this Government. There is no question on the face of the earth about that. Our Treasury needs this money, and if the Cuban Government is able to pay it I see no reason why it should not be requested to pay it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Has the President now the power to deal with the Cuban Government on this subject?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I think he has that power, but this is a reminder—

Mr. MANN. Would he not have just as much power now as he would have if we passed this item?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. This is a reminder to the President, and a congressional sanction or authority for the President to act.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will permit, are we not just now on both sides of the Chamber, in the main—at least those who feel the responsibility—trying to keep Congress from interfering with the President in our foreign relations? And

does the gentleman think it is an apt time for Congress to poke its nose into the relations between this country and foreign affairs?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I think the gentleman is doing all he can to keep Congress from interfering with the President in our diplomatic relations. Not all of his side are.

Mr. MANN. I am doing that now on this item.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. This would in no way cause friction or tend to create trouble. We can trust the President to take care of that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the time of the gentleman be extended for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request.

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to inquire whether the State Department has made any recommendation that this item should be included in the bill or has recommended that it should be passed?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The State Department made no formal recommendation to the committee. A member of the committee, who is the author of this amendment, stated that the State Department—and I do not know with whom he conferred in the State Department—thought it ought to be included in this bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is purely on the initiative of the committee and has been recommended in the State Department?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It was in a bill referred to our committee. The initiative was in Congress.

Mr. STAFFORD. Was the bill referred to the State Department for its approval or disapproval?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Not formally.

Mr. GARNER. Was any estimate of it made in the Book of Estimates?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. No.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I want to say this in relation to the point of order: I am opposed to our Government assuming, in the first place, the rôle of international policeman; but when we do it and interfere with the affairs of the people of other countries, I think it is in bad taste for us then to ask those people to pay us for our meddling, and I am opposed to the President of the United States making this request. Therefore I insist on the point of order.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. But, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman yielded to me for a question.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman wants unanimous consent, he can get it at any time, no doubt.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Very well; go ahead.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN FINANCIERS.

That the President is hereby authorized to extend to the Governments of Central and South America an invitation to be represented by their ministers of finance and leading bankers, not exceeding three in number in each case, to attend a conference with the Secretary of the Treasury in the city of Washington at such date as shall be determined by the President, with a view of establishing closer and more satisfactory financial relations between their countries and the United States of America; and authority is hereby given to the Secretary of the Treasury to invite, in his discretion, representative bankers of the United States to participate in the said conference.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold his point of order for just a moment?

Mr. MANN. Yes; I will withhold the point of order for a moment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I rose simply for the purpose of suggesting that it would be well to put in Cuba and Santo Domingo if you are going to invite them.

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That for the purpose of meeting such actual and necessary expenses as may be incidental to the meeting of said conference, and for

the entertainment of the foreign conferees, the sum of \$50,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman reserve it or make it?

Mr. MANN. I make it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood] want to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I concede it is good. I would like to say something, however, about the merits of it, if it is reserved.

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Now, Mr. Chairman, I move that we return to the two items passed over temporarily, on page 18 and page 27.

Mr. MANN. Let the Clerk read the item.

The Clerk read as follows:

WATERWAYS TREATY, UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN: INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN.

For salaries and expenses, including salaries of commissioners and salaries of clerks and other employees appointed by the commissioners on the part of the United States, with the approval solely of the Secretary of State, including rental of offices at Washington, D. C., expense of printing, and necessary traveling and other expenses, and for one-half of all reasonable and necessary joint expenses of the international joint commission incurred under the terms of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain concerning the use of boundary waters between the United States and Canada, and for other purposes, signed January 11, 1909, as well as for the payment of necessary expenses, not to exceed the sum of \$5,000, incurred, and compensation for services rendered under the direction of the Secretary of State in the examination and preparation of cases involving the use, distribution, or division of waters and other questions or matters of difference covered by the treaty of January 11, 1909, between the United States and Great Britain, and in representing this Government and the American interests involved in the presentation of such cases before the international joint commission constituted under that treaty, \$40,000, together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation made for this object for the fiscal year 1915, said amounts to be disbursed under the direction of the Secretary of State: *Provided*, That no part of the appropriation shall be expended for subsistence of the commission, its attorney and secretary, except the sum of \$5 per day when absent from Washington on official business; and no part of it shall be expended for subsistence and traveling expenses from and to their places of residence and Washington.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on these words:

Not to exceed the sum of \$5,000, incurred, and compensation for services rendered under the direction of the Secretary of State in the examination and preparation of cases involving the use, distribution, or division of waters and other questions or matters of difference covered by the treaty of January 11, 1909, between the United States and Great Britain, and in representing this Government and the American interests involved in the presentation of such cases before the International Joint Commission constituted under that treaty.

I want to ask the chairman of the committee whether that \$5,000 is not at this time being given to a gentleman for the purpose of acting as special counsel, whose title was first "counsel for the International Joint Commission" and then afterwards changed to "counsel for the United States before the commission."

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I think Mr. Tawney, a member of the commission, told me that there was some letter written to the commission which gave the gentleman a title different from the one that is carried in this bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. My information is that this \$5,000 is paid to a gentleman by the name of Manton M. Wyvel.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The best man connected with the commission; worth the whole bunch of them.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I suppose so, since the personnel has been recently changed; but this gentleman, Mr. Manton M. Wyvel, was private secretary to the Secretary of State.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. That is true; and Mr. Tawney was chairman of the Appropriations Committee in this House just before he was appointed, and Mr. Busby, who was secretary of the commission, was secretary to Speaker Cannon just before he was appointed on this commission.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes; but this gentleman, Mr. Wyvel, is not a member of the commission. He was appointed at the request of Mr. Bryan. On November 11, 1913, he was appointed "counsel for the International Joint Commission" at a salary of \$5,000. Now, where does that salary come from?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It is coming out of this fund, and he was appointed at the request of this commission. The Hon. James A. Tawney, the chairman of the commission, appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs nearly a year before the gentleman was appointed, and said that the commission was

put to great disadvantage because England and English claimants were represented by lawyers familiar with the questions presented to the commission, while the United States was not represented at all, or was represented by some gentleman assigned by the Department of Justice, who was not familiar with the questions the commission was considering, and that therefore American interests suffered; and they suggested that an attorney or counsel should be assigned to familiarize himself with this work and appear before the commission.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Oh, yes; I understand that. The English Government was represented by counsel, but this gentleman was appointed to inform the counsel, and not to represent the United States.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. That is not a fact at all, as I happen to know. He was appointed to represent the United States. Mr. Tawney informed me that the title first given him was not the title that he ought to have. I do not remember what it was. The wrong title was given him inadvertently, and it was changed.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It was not given inadvertently; it was given that way so as to give a shadow of authority for paying him out of the fund appropriated for the commission. Let me give you some of the facts in relation to this appointment. First, I should like to ask what cases this gentleman has prepared, representing the Government of the United States?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. He has just been appointed, not very long ago. You ask me what cases he has prepared. I will tell you that I do not think they will be very numerous, because I do not think there is very much for this commission, which was established by the last Republican administration to take care of their lame ducks.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I suppose that is true; and I notice that you managed to get a lame duck on it immediately afterwards, and put off a good Democrat in order to put him there, too.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. We are bound by treaty to take care of these cases. The good Democrat whom the gentleman speaks of resigned because he did not care to render service on the commission any longer.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman refers to a very distinguished citizen of my State, and I happen to know something about his case. Does the gentleman want to convey the impression that the distinguished gentleman on this commission—I refer to ex-Senator Turner—was not requested to resign from that commission?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Then the gentleman is wrong.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I am not.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. He was given to understand by the Secretary of State directly that he wanted him to get off of that commission, in order that he might give the place to one of his friends.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I know what I am talking about on that. The gentleman is talking about a distinguished citizen of my State, a distinguished Democrat and a lawyer of great ability; a man of the highest honor and standing, and my personal friend. And when the gentleman from Virginia makes the statement that this gentleman resigned without an intimation from the Secretary of State that he wanted him to get off that commission the gentleman is not stating what is correct.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I am referring to ex-Senator Turner, and I agree with the gentleman about Senator Turner; but the gentleman is mistaken about his resignation being requested.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I know about that part of it. I repeat that he was given to understand by the Secretary of State that his resignation was desired. Ask the Secretary of State and see if he will deny it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALDER. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. CALDER. Does the gentleman know that Mr. Wyvell was a candidate for Congress from a New York district in 1912 and 1914, and that he is devoting the most of his time to making political speeches around the country?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will give you a little information about Mr. Wyvell. I do not know anything about the particular matter to which the gentleman refers, but I know that Mr. Bryan, on November 11, 1913, appointed Mr. Wyvell under the title of "counsel for the International Joint Commission" at a salary of \$5,000. You might just as well appoint one of the page boys of this House to advise the Supreme Court of the United States upon legal questions as to appoint this gentleman to advise a commission composed of great lawyers on legal questions.

Then they made the discovery that that was not the proper thing to do, and so about December 16 the Secretary wrote a supplemental letter and changed the title to "counsel for the United States before the commission." Before that, when we had an important matter the department that was particularly interested in it furnished the counsel. For instance, when we had the case known as the Livingston Channel case the Department of Justice assigned Mr. Strickland from the department to represent it, as I recall. In the Sault Ste. Marie case they sent Mr. Koons, the law officer of the Chief of Engineers, to represent them. Now they have a distinguished gentleman that was a private secretary to the Secretary of State given the place, and the Secretary has directed the commission to pay his friend a salary monthly at the rate of \$5,000 a year. Does the Secretary of State under the construction of this law have the right to direct the payment of that money?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. He does. We thought it was necessary to give somebody control over the expenditure of this money besides the commission, that has heretofore been too extravagant with it. For instance, although the home of the commission is in Washington, these gentlemen have been allowing themselves \$10 a day for subsistence for every day they were away from their homes on the business of the commission, whether they were in Washington or elsewhere.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Why does not the gentleman move to abolish the commission?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. We can not do it; we are bound by treaty to keep it up. We did cut the appropriation down, and we did put into this bill a provision by which to curtail their extravagance.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. But you want to give \$5,000 to some one who has not done anything.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. We do not do anything of the kind. Mr. Wyvell's salary began only on the day when he assumed the duties of the position indicated in this paragraph. It is only for payment when he is rendering services. Mr. Tawney, who was then chairman of the commission, appeared before the committee and complained of the system which the gentleman from Washington prefers, of assigning attorneys from the Department of Justice to his commission, and said that American interests were put to a great disadvantage before the joint commission in dealing with questions between this country and Great Britain by reason of that fact, and he suggested that counsel ought to be assigned to do this particular work before the commission. Whether there was a mistake in giving the counsel a proper title in the first instance, I have only the information from Mr. Tawney, from whom, I presume, the gentleman got his information.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I have never spoken to Mr. Tawney in my life about this matter, either directly or indirectly. Who are the members of the commission?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Hon. James A. Tawney, ex-Gov. Glenn, of North Carolina, and ex-Senator Obadiah G. Gardner, of Maine.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. In the hearings the other day, when this question arose before the gentleman's committee, did not Mr. Gardner say that he was opposed to this special counsel? And did not Mr. Tawney add also that he wanted to be placed in the same category?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. They did not say that.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Was not that the substance of what they said?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. No; because Mr. Tawney had been there before and asked for him, and Senator Gardner backed him up in that request.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. What Senator Gardner did say was, after he became chairman of the commission, he approved of the restriction upon the expenditure of this fund and thought the

members of the commission should devote all of their time to the work.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. If the gentleman from Virginia has no objection, I will place in the Record the statements of Mr. Tawney and Mr. Gardner before the committee.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I have no objection. Mr. Tawney did make this objection, that this money ought not to come out of this fund; that it ought not to reduce the fund that they handle. The committee thought they had too large an appropriation, and we not only required that this payment should come out of that appropriation, but we cut it down \$10,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want to ask the gentleman another question. This special counsel, as he is now called, has a suite of offices in the Woodward Building in this city. I would like to know how those offices are furnished and how the expenses are paid. Does it come out of this fund of \$40,000?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Under the direction of the Secretary of State?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It will be in the future.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I think I understand the situation. Here is a gentleman appointed by the Secretary of State special counsel of the United States, notwithstanding that heretofore counsel has been assigned by the Department of Justice or some other department where counsel was particularly qualified for the work; that he was appointed by the Secretary of State; that he is being paid by the month at the request of the Secretary of State; and that he has furnished an office, and the rent of that office is paid at the request of the Secretary of State; and, so far, my information is that he has not prepared any case nor done any work for this commission, but is helping the distinguished Secretary of State in getting places for deserving Democrats; and I make the point of order.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. That has about as much foundation as most of the statements that the gentleman makes. Here is what Mr. Tawney said:

The difficulty heretofore has been that there was no authority for the appointment of anyone in the State Department, and there was no appropriation out of which to pay for the services, and it was at their request, at the request of the State Department officials, that I consented, as chairman of the United States section of the International Joint Commission, a year ago, that \$5,000, or so much thereof as might be necessary, should be paid for the services and the expenses incident to appearing before the commission, to be taken out of our appropriation. It was then that they first selected some one to represent the Government of the United States. We regarded it as so essential that we were willing to have it appear that the expenses of the commission were \$5,000 more than they actually are. That was the only way out of it, and that was the reason for the appropriation. The expenditure of the appropriation is all under the direction of the Secretary of State anyway, so that I do not see that it makes much difference whether it comes out of one pocket or another.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I am unable to follow the gentleman. From just what line was he reading?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I was reading from the statement of Mr. Tawney, on page 71 and page 72, in reference to the employment of Mr. Wyvell as counsel. He did object, in some part of the hearings, I recall, to compensation coming out of this appropriation, but he says here that so essential does he regard it that they have a counsel that they would consent to have their appropriation taxed with this additional \$5,000. As to Mr. Wyvell's ability as an attorney, he is an able attorney, a high-class man, a splendid citizen, nominated, as somebody suggested, by one of the great New York districts for Congress, and he is a man who made a very efficient secretary to the Secretary of State, and is amply able to cope with the lawyers who will represent Great Britain before this tribunal.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly satisfied that a gentleman who would accept a position at \$5,000 a year must be capable to advise this international commission, and that he must be a great international lawyer. That fact alone is sufficient evidence to prove that he is competent to fill a high position of that character.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Oh, I recall that the gentleman from Washington served here for \$5,000 a year, with only the addition of mileage.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. And was very willing to do it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. But I never posed as a great international lawyer.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The gentleman certainly posed as a statesman, and a statesman ought to be worth as much as a lawyer.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Oh, I would not plead guilty to even that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want now to read to the gentleman what I had in mind a little while ago, because I do not want either the gentleman or the House to think that I had no foundation for the statement I made. The Chairman says:

The counsel for the United States would have to go wherever the commission sits?

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes; if, in the judgment of the Secretary of State, the interests of the United States Government required that.

I have no objection to a counsel for the United States. The United States ought to be represented, but heretofore the United States has been represented by the different departments without any additional salary. They have always taken some one; but here is what was said:

The CHAIRMAN. Would he pay his own expenses?

Mr. TAWNEY. No; it would have to be paid out of the \$5,000.

Do I understand the gentleman to contend that this gentleman's expenses are paid out of that \$5,000?

Mr. SMITH of New York. No.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Not under this law.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Then I read further from the hearings:

Mr. GOODWIN. Then the salary and the expenses incident to the appearing of counsel before the commission would have to be paid out of that \$5,000?

Mr. TAWNEY. There is a variance of opinion concerning the construction of that provision.

Mr. GARDNER. I would like to say in connection with this matter that Gov. Glenn and myself were opposed to the appointment of an attorney as a part of the American section of the international joint commission.

Mr. TAWNEY. I would like to have you include me in that statement ment also, because that was so.

I thought I was right about that. All of them objected to this special council.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. But the gentleman is not right. They were opposed to the commission having a counsel, to the appointment of an attorney as part of the American section of the commission. They wanted the United States to have a counsel to represent this Government before the commission. They did not want the commission to have a counsel.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. That is exactly what the gentleman was appointed for.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. That is not what he is now.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. And the reason they changed it was because they discovered there would be some difficulty about getting his salary.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Oh, no. It was simply the correction of a mistake.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. There was no mistake about it. The change was made so that the Secretary of State, as he thought, might have authority to direct the payment of his salary. I make the point of order.

Mr. MANN. I will ask the gentleman to reserve it for a while.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I reserve it.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Washington yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. I want to state, in reference to this gentleman, that I indorse every word the chairman of the committee so tersely said about Mr. Wyvell. I know Mr. Turner is regarded as a first-class lawyer, a good man in every respect, but I know Mr. Wyvell personally very well, that he is the peer of Mr. Turner in every respect, and is a first-class lawyer. He lived in the district that I have the honor to represent for a number of years, and I know him well as a neighbor and a citizen. He is entirely competent in every respect to occupy the position to which he has been named and will reflect credit on the Government in the important position he now occupies.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. But he does not take the position of Senator Turner.

Mr. GOULDEN. I consider him just as good a lawyer, and that is quite complimentary to him, as Senator Turner stands deservedly high in his profession.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the aspersions cast upon Mr. Wyvell's ability as a lawyer by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] ought to go unanswered. Of course, if that statement were confined in knowledge to the membership of the House, who know the gentleman from Washington and know the amount of bombast he unloads on the House almost daily in malicious criticism of the administration or some of its principal administrative officers, it would be a different proposition; but I want to call the attention of the country to some of the men who recommended Mr. Wyvell—men who know him, men who are acquainted with his ability—and place their statements in the balance against the statement of the gentleman from Washington, and let the House and the

country know whether there is any foundation for the gentleman's statement. I read from the statement of Secretary Bryan in the hearings:

He is recommended by a large number of persons in New York who are acquainted with his legal ability, among others Hon. Samuel Seabury, recently elected judge of the Court of Appeals of New York State; by Hon. John Ford, Hon. Charles L. Guy, Hon. James A. Blanchard, Hon. L. A. Giegerich, Hon. Mitchell L. Erlanger, justices of the supreme court of the first district; and by Hon. John P. Cohalan, surrogate of New York County; by Hon. William F. Schneider, county clerk of New York County; by Hon. Cuthbert W. Pound; Herbert P. Bissell; Harry L. Taylor, justice of the Supreme Court of New York State, eighth judicial district; by Hon. James W. Gerard, ambassador to Germany; Hon. E. R. O'Malley, formerly attorney general of New York State; Hon. Frank Irvine, dean of the Cornell Law School; and E. H. Woodruff, professor of law in the Cornell Law School.

I think that is sufficient indorsement to say whether Mr. Wyvell is competent to occupy this position, and the source of authority is so great and the information is such that it ought to be received by this House and by the Secretary of State, who suggested the appointment of Mr. Wyvell, as sufficient to warrant the appointment. I do not think the statement made by the gentleman from Washington that the appointment was made without regard to qualification ought to go unchallenged. I make this answer in defense of a man who can not answer for himself.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of those who do not know the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE], who has just resumed his seat, and as he says for the benefit of the country, I would like to say that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] has no superior in this House in the way of ability. He is one of the best working Members of the House, and he thinks and talks clearly. If the gentleman from Indiana would study the gentleman from Washington and emulate his example, he would be a much better Member of the House than he is, and he is not a bad one at that.

An honest confession, it is said, is good for the soul; and I am going to make a little confession and take part of the blame. This commission was created several years ago, ostensibly in accord with the provisions of a treaty. It has been operating for some years and I presume doing some very good work. The former secretary of the commission was Mr. Busby, who used to be the secretary to the Speaker of the House, Mr. Cannon. When the Democratic administration came into power it was reasonable to suppose that the commission would be reconstituted and be made up of two Democrats and one Republican. It was reasonable to suppose that the new reconstituted commission would employ a Democratic secretary. The commission, in fact, was not immediately reconstituted, though it was shortly; but the commission as reconstituted really wanted to keep Mr. Busby in as secretary, and I am frank to say I wanted to keep Mr. Busby in as secretary; but in a moment of temporary mental aberration I suggested that Mr. Klutz, who was then being urged for appointment as secretary of this commission by the Secretary of State, should be appointed as counsel for the commission and that Mr. Busby be allowed to remain as secretary of the commission. Fatal suggestion. As soon as the recommendation was made—and I ought to have known it—that there could be a new place created, the suggestion was accepted. The new place was created and Mr. Busby did not keep his place. Mr. Klutz was appointed secretary of the commission and the new place was filled by another noble Democrat. I do not criticize the department for doing this. I am only sorry that in a moment I suggested this extravagance, though I do not think that extravagance is so much in the counsel as it is in the rest of the membership connected with the commission and their employees. However, I will try to make it up some time and save that \$5,000 somewhere else.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, it seems to have become a fashion recently with a few certain gentlemen every time I make a remark to get up and reply by something of the character of the statement made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE]. Now, a while ago while I was speaking about Mr. Wyvell I did not reflect upon his character. It was the character of the position which he was holding to which I was objecting, because I do not believe from what I know about it that he has rendered any service. But the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE] immediately rose and made a statement the character of which has been made familiar by these featherweight statesmen who are back scratching the President and the Secretary of State. Now, gentlemen, I am not going to criticize him, because if there is anything I admire about a bootlicker it is his faithfulness. For these gentlemen who stand

up here and defend the Secretary of State for patronage received, I have nothing but admiration. But because they receive this compensation I do not want them to think that they can stand up here on this floor every time I make a remark upon any occasion and attack me in the manner they have. Since I have been a Member of this House, and I leave it to the gentlemen on each side, I have never attacked any man personally except when I have first been attacked, never; and in the speeches I made I did not refer to any gentleman in person, and I give notice that this method of some of these would-be statesmen on that side of the House attacking me and villifying me personally every time I speak is going to come to an end, or I am going to have something to say in reply. There is a certain class of individuals so constituted, so narrow brained, that if you let a thing of this kind pass by too long they take it for cowardice or for a degree of good nature which I may not always possess.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw the point of order?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The Chair does not sustain that point of order; it is based on a treaty.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has not made any argument against it.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The Chair did not give me time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will give the gentleman time.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation is founded upon a treaty between this country and Great Britain. The only authority we have for making any part of this appropriation is by the fact we have a treaty and that treaty authorizes this Government to appoint, on the part of this Government, the necessary officials to attend the meeting of this joint tribunal.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield in that particular?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I had occasion some years ago to review that treaty which was entered into between this country and Great Britain, and I do not think the context of the treaty agrees with the statement of the gentleman that there was any authority for the employment of these officials—

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The treaty has that provision, and it necessarily follows that the Government could not carry out the provisions of this treaty without the necessary officials. The appropriation is authorized by treaty.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will say further, for the benefit of the Chair, if he will permit, when the original authorization was first incorporated in an appropriation bill it was the understanding on this side that it was subject to a point of order. I remember having examined the treaty at that time. Now, I have not had occasion to examine it since.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia (reading)—

This commission was created by authority of the treaty of January 11, 1909, between the United States and Great Britain to pass upon applications approved by either Government for the use, obstruction or diversion of the boundary waters on one side that might affect the level on the other side, the construction of dams or obstructions in the boundary waters; the decision of the commission being final in those cases. The commission may also be called upon to examine and report on other differences between the two Governments, involving rights, obligations and interests along the boundary.

Under that treaty this commission was constituted and of course the necessary assistants for the commission are contemplated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not find this includes assistants to the commission. The Chair finds that this counsel is to be employed for the United States before the commission.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman mean to say that the treaty would cover that or carry that?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes; because it is necessary to carry out the treaty.

The CHAIRMAN. But this counsel is to argue cases before the commission; he is not a counsel to advise the commission at all.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. That is true.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I call attention to the fact that this is a new position, one that has only been created recently, as the gentleman from Illinois has stated. It was not necessary before, because counsel were assigned from the other department.

The CHAIRMAN. It is in the appropriation bill for last year.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. But I think that was the first time it was carried.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It was in last year's appropriation bill. It was put in there upon the suggestion of the then chairman of the commission, Mr. Tawney, and this is a limitation on the rest of the appropriation. If it is not paid out of this appropriation there will have to be no appropriation made for it. So this is a limitation upon this appropriation, the amount that the commission has to expend.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think the question of whether another appropriation would have to be made to pay this counsel should enter into our consideration at all. The provision reads:

As well as for the payment of necessary expenses, not to exceed the sum of \$5,000, incurred, and compensation for services rendered under the direction of the Secretary of State in the examination and preparation of cases involving the use, distribution, or division of waters and other questions or matters of difference covered by the treaty of January 11, 1909.

And then goes along:

And in representing this Government and the American interests involved in the presentation of such cases before the International Joint Commission constituted under that treaty.

Now, he is not appointed as counsel for the commission at all. He is employed to prepare the cases of the people—American citizens—to be presented before the Joint High Commission. Now, how it can be claimed that this is covered by a treaty creating a Joint High Commission the Chair can not see.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. This is for salaries and expenses, including salaries of commissioners and salaries of clerks and other employees appointed by the commission on the part of the United States, making an appropriation of \$40,000, and here is a limitation on it of \$5,000. And on that account it would be in order. It limits the amount to be appropriated to the commissioners and clerks for salaries and things to \$35,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman mean to say that unless there is an authorization you have the right in an appropriation act to limit the expenditure of \$5,000 of this money? You can not use a limitation for an authorization.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. If it is a limitation, you can. Here is an appropriation of \$40,000 and here is a provision in it that takes \$5,000 from the commission to pay the counsel for this Government who appear before the commission. It is a limitation on that appropriation. It saves money to the Treasury, and, therefore, it is in order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is referring to an authorization for the payment of clerks and employees by the commission. The Chair has pointed out that this official is really to be appointed, not by the commission but by the Secretary of State, and therefore it is not a limitation on the authority of the commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not view it that this is a limitation at all. It merely uses this wording to show how it should expend \$5,000, and is not a limitation but an expenditure of \$5,000—and for what? To prepare cases to be presented to the joint high commission, and not to advise the joint high commission.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, the treaty that was entered into between the United States and Canada was for the purpose of settling differences that might arise between the two Governments about the boundary waters. Under that treaty it only states that each side shall appoint three commissioners and other officers, but under the act of Congress of 1911 this wording, at least inferentially, would give authority for the employment of a counsellor for the joint high commissioners representing the United States. And I might say in that connection that Canada is represented by counsel. I think it was stated before our committee that they had two counsellors. I am not sure about that, but they at least had one, and the commissioners representing this country thought it was fair to this country to be represented by counsel also. Here is the reading of the act of Congress of March 4, 1911.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman kindly give the page and volume?

Mr. HARRISON. The page is 1364, Sixty-first Congress, 1910-11, United States Statutes at Large.

Mr. STAFFORD. What volume of the statutes?

Mr. HARRISON. Volume 36. It says:

For salaries and expenses, including salaries of commissioners and salaries of clerks appointed by the commissioners on the part of the United States with the approval solely of the Secretary of State, including rental and furnishing, after the passage of this act, of offices at Washington, D. C., and necessary traveling expenses, and for one-half of all reasonable and necessary joint expenses of the International

Joint Commission incurred under the terms of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain concerning the use of boundary waters between the United States and Canada, and other purposes, signed January 11, 1909, \$75,000, together with the balance unexpended July 1, 1911, of the appropriation made for said joint commission for the fiscal year 1911.

Now, I call the Chairman's attention—

The CHAIRMAN. Is that the appropriation bill?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; but that is the authority of law, because that is the authority of law that gave to the President the right to fix these salaries and which, at least inferentially, would give the right to appoint other officers to carry out the purposes of the treaty between Canada and the United States. It says further:

Provided, That the salaries of the members of said commission on the part of the United States shall be fixed by the President, and the amount appropriated for the payment of salaries and other expenses hereunder shall be disbursed under the direction of the Secretary of State; that said commission or any member thereof shall have power to administer oaths—

And so forth.

So I submit the wording of that statute, "the amount appropriated for the payment of salaries and other expenses hereunder shall be disbursed under the direction of the Secretary of State," would carry out the purpose of the treaty, for the treaty says that these various officers shall be employed to carry out the terms of the treaty, without limiting the number or character of officers. I submit that there is authority of law for this appropriation for this counsel.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will indulge me, I think that, having some familiarity with the procedure before this commission, I may make it clear to the Chair that the treaty should be the basis for the legislation for an official of this sort favored in the bill. Some people from my State were the first who were obliged to appear before this commission, and I assisted them at best I could, so that I have had some familiarity with the work and procedure of the commission.

The CHAIRMAN. Can the gentleman throw any light on the point of order?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. I think I can. The Chair will note that under the treaty there can be but two litigants—the United States and Canada. Under the treaty the commission itself is a judicial tribunal. It is the only permanent judicial tribunal between the two nations. There is no other, and the commission has a vast responsibility under the treaty in deciding matters and controversies which may be referred to the commission by the two Governments.

Now, the Chair must remember that before this judicial tribunal only two litigants can appear—the Canadian Government and the American Government—and that each Government must present its own case on matters for judicial determination. Under the treaty these Governments appear in a case. I think those are the words that were used in the treaty case and questions and matters of difference. The Chairman read, I think, correctly from the treaty.

When any citizens of the United States appear to have a matter which should be presented to the commission, as my people have appeared to have, and seek that a matter be submitted to the tribunal, they first go to the Department of State. The department, under the language of the treaty, is then obliged to formulate an application to present a case on matters to the commission. The Secretary of State and the United States as a party to the treaty then assume the responsibility of presenting this case to this judicial tribunal. That application is presented by the United States itself, and that treaty requires that it be done; and this is the official provided in this bill that this treaty requires now to prepare and present the matter for the United States. So that it seems to me it is clearly implied from the requirements of the treaty itself, a necessary provision for the United States making its application and presenting its case to the commission, that there should be proper officials to present the matter to a judicial tribunal.

Now, who are these proper officials? Who prescribes the proper officials? Why, Congress, of course, has plenary authority in such matter to prescribe how the treaty shall be made effective, and Congress has provided this official as one of the proper officials to present this matter. It can call him anything it pleases, but his duty is to make effective the provisions of this treaty and present the case of the United States. No private individual can perform such duty. The law prohibits it. So it must be done by an official provided by Congress, and this is the man. I can not see how the treaty can be made effective unless something like this be done. If so, it must and should be in order in this bill.

Now, incidentally, Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the committee itself to the importance of this tribunal, and

I claim to have some information in regard to it, because, as this committee knows, my relations with Mr. Tawney were intimate when he was a Member of this House, and I know that those who knew him and know him now need not be assured that he needs no defense from those who were associated with him on the floor of this House. He was not only able and capable but was always solicitous for the public expense and the observance of the law and proprieties. He was careful of the public funds when he was the guardian of them, and I know he has not changed in this respect. This tribunal is one of the most important and one of the most dignified tribunals of its kind in the world, and gentlemen of the committee underestimate the responsibilities which it has had and the responsibilities that it must have incident to the controversies and cases and matters and differences which may be submitted by the United States to this commission.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him for a moment?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Certainly.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I do not think that anything I have said would warrant the conclusion that I underestimate the importance of the commission or the importance of their work. The statement I made was that up to this time they had done very little work and had decided very few cases, and the criticism I had of the commission was that in former times they had made a loose expenditure of this money.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman underestimates the work, both the amount and importance, which has been done and the work that is pending before this commission. The matter that came from my State was the first. It involved the boundary waters, the Lake of the Woods and Rainy Lake, between Minnesota and Canada, with their vast potentialities of manufacturing and its large interests, involving untold millions of dollars for power and navigation and the fisheries. Just west of us there is a very intricate controversy which has been under way for many years, and, if I recall, is expressly covered by the treaty concerning the Milk River, in Montana; capable of irrigating hundreds of thousands of acres of land. That river rises in the United States and flows up into Canada and comes back into the United States and possibly flows back into Canada again. I do not recall the exact geography on the controversy, but it is of great importance. How those waters shall be distributed and allotted has been a matter of controversy for years. The question involves millions of dollars and hundreds of thousands of acres of land and hundreds of thousands of people and will extend through the long future. That is a matter which is now under settlement by the commission.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Yes; I will be glad to yield to the gentleman on that point.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I suggest to the gentleman that the United States Government has appropriated \$5,000,000 for irrigation projects on the Milk River, which belongs to this general subject of settling the question of boundary waters.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Yes. I am glad the gentleman did interrupt me.

The matter of the height of the waters of Lake Superior involves, Mr. Chairman, the commerce on Lake Superior and that passing through the Soo Canal, which this commission has been considering for several years, and this committee knows that that commerce is larger than that in any other waters in the world. The commerce of this canal and of the waters sought to be controlled which these gentlemen have been considering in the last few years is annually larger than the commerce which can ever pass through the Panama Canal. More than 79,000,000 tons of commerce passed through those canals at the Soo last year, while the possible capacity of the Panama Canal, working day and night for 365 days in the year, is only 80,000,000 tons. More canals are being constructed right now connecting the lakes on both sides—the Canadian and the American sides—because the possible increase will be so great. This commission must give its approval and pass on questions affecting the height and control of those waters, and recently by its wise action produced an annual revenue to the United States of \$66,000 per annum for 30 years, or about \$7,000,000 for the Treasury.

What I wish to point out to the committee is that this commission, which has charge of the controversies concerning the use of that water, the height of the water, and the diversion of the water, is a tremendously important body, and its dignity and authority should be guarded and respected. Those controversies will continually arise between Canada on the one side

and the United States on the other as to the use, diversion, height, and pollution of these waters.

I think the commission has been investigating the pollution of the water which is expressly provided by the treaty, which is a most important matter, affecting the welfare of the people of a most important part of this country. Thousands of people pass over these lakes and are obliged to use that water. Millions of people live on the borders of those lakes and must use that water in one way or another. It is of the utmost importance for this country and for Canada to have the right kind of use and disposition of that water, and that must come on our part through careful investigation by the Government of the United States, and then a proper presentation of these important matters to this commission. It is therefore the duty of the United States to be properly represented before this commission, to properly prepare its case as the treaty requires, and this is the official provided by Congress to represent it. It makes no difference who the person may be, but it is important to have the right kind of an official provided by Congress to represent the United States in this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I presume that the Chair is desirous of having information as to the authority which the law or the treaty gives for the appointment of this official. I have in my hand the original treaty, and I direct the attention of the Chair to Article VII of that treaty, which is the authority for the appointment of the three commissioners by the respective Governments. It is as follows:

The high contracting parties agree to establish and maintain an international joint commission of the United States and Canada, composed of six commissioners—three on the part of the United States, appointed by the President thereof, and three on the part of the United Kingdom, appointed by His Majesty on the recommendation of the Governor in Council of the Dominion of Canada.

I now direct the attention of the Chair to the really pertinent paragraph as to the appointment of assistants, clerks, and secretaries, and providing for their expenses. It is found in the second paragraph of Article XII of the treaty:

The United States and Canadian sections of the commission may each appoint a secretary, and these shall act as joint secretaries of the commission at its joint sessions; and the commission may employ engineers and clerical assistants from time to time as it may deem advisable. The salaries and personal expenses of the commission and of the secretaries shall be paid by their respective Governments, and all reasonable and necessary joint expenses of the commission incurred by it shall be paid in equal moieties by the high contracting parties.

That is warrant for carrying in an appropriation bill items providing for the salaries of the commissioners, the secretaries, and for clerical assistants employed by the commission, and for incidental expenses incurred by it. This paragraph must also be considered in connection with the appropriation law already cited by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], which is:

Provided, That the salaries of the members of the said commission on the part of the United States shall be fixed by the President—

That is not in conflict with the treaty obligation. And further—

and the amount appropriated for the payment of salaries and other expenses hereunder shall be disbursed under the direction of the Secretary of State.

Shall be disbursed. It refers to the expenses for clerical assistance and other expenses which the commission is authorized to incur under the treaty, and only the Secretary of State shall be the disbursing officer.

It is a matter of indifference to me who is the person filling this position. I am only presenting this to the Chair for him to determine whether there is any authorization of law for the employment by the Secretary of State of a counsel for the presentation of cases before this commission. Certainly the treaty which I have read to the Chair and also the paragraph cited by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] contains no warrant for the employment by the Secretary of State of any outside officials.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will be glad to.

Mr. HARRISON. I want to say that on the first reading of that paragraph that the gentleman has cited I was of the same opinion as the gentleman is, because it specifies that they can appoint these secretaries and engineering and clerical forces; but if the gentleman will read that article 12 a little further he will find that the concluding clause of that article is as follows:

The commission may adopt such rules of procedure as shall be in accordance with justice and equity, and may make such examination in person and through agents or employees as may be deemed advisable.

Mr. STAFFORD. The commission may, not the Secretary of State.

Mr. HARRISON. The commission may do it, and if the commission think it is advisable to employ counsel to make the investigation, certainly under the terms of the treaty they have a right to employ that counsel, who may be either an employee or an agent, to make that examination. It strikes me that the very article the gentleman has cited gives authority of law.

Mr. STAFFORD. But the gentleman will see that the commission are not employing the counsel, nor have they prescribed any rules or regulations for the employment of counsel. It is an outside matter for the Secretary of State to employ this counsel.

Mr. HARRISON. This counsel is certainly to aid the commission, and while the appointment is not made directly by the commission, it is made on the recommendation of the commission.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is nothing on the face to show that.

Mr. HARRISON. Here is a place that ought to be filled, and it is left optional with the Secretary of State to fill it.

Mr. STAFFORD. You can not bring it within this authority by any such statement as that.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to section 817 of the Manual, a note under Rule XXI, which says:

The authorization by existing law required in the rule to justify appropriations may be made also by a treaty, if it has been ratified by both the contracting parties.

I think clearly the treaty covers this situation.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, in construing a statute or treaty it seems to me that some weight should be attached to what has been done under it. What has been the course of procedure? I think it has been stated by some of the parties to this controversy that there has been one appropriation made of a like character. I think it is true that since the inception of this treaty and since the organization of this commission there has been a similar official employed under the Republican administration.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken about that. The gentleman did not listen to the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. The Republican Secretary of State did employ a man from Massachusetts by the name of Bumpus.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I repeat that under the Republican administration, and shortly after this commission was created, a similar official was appointed, and this is the first time a point of order has been raised against an appropriation of this character. I think the Chairman ought to take into consideration what the authors of the law had in mind, as clearly defined by a long line of unbroken procedure since 1909, the time of the adoption of the law.

I am glad my distinguished colleague [Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington] had nothing to say against the personal character of Mr. Wyvell or his ability to fill the position creditably. I have known Mr. Wyvell for the last 15 years, and I know him to be a man of high character and exceptional legal ability, standing high in his own State and in his own party, and entitled to all the respect that this Congress or any other department of this Government can give him. The fact that he has been the private secretary to the Secretary of State should not sway our action in this matter one iota. He is a man capable of filling the position, and he will do honor to the service in which he is engaged. I trust the Chairman will not sustain the point of order, for I am satisfied that the position which Mr. Wyvell holds is within the contemplation of the act creating the commission, and Mr. Wyvell or some one else will have to be appointed to represent the Government in matters pending before the commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has considered all the arguments on this point of order and regrets that he is unable to agree with the gentlemen who desire to retain this appropriation in the bill. The Chair views it that here is a high court, created for the consideration of cases between Canada and the United States. He views it that this commission have the right to incur expenses for clerical services and matters of that kind and to pay them out of the appropriation, according to the terms of the treaty. But the Chair does not feel that we have the right to limit any item in this appropriation bill except to pay—

For services rendered under the direction of the Secretary of State in the examination and preparation of cases involving the use, distribution, or division of waters and other questions or matters of difference covered by the treaty of January 11, 1909, between the United States and Great Britain, and in representing this Government and the American interests involved in the presentation of such cases before the international joint commission constituted under that treaty.

The distinction the Chair makes is that here is an attempt to employ counsel, not to advise the commission but to act under the direction of the Secretary of State in preparing cases to be presented to this commission, an absolutely different situation. The counsel is not to act under the direction of the commission; he is to act under the direction of the Secretary of State, and his whole duties are to present the suits in which the United States Government and the American interests are involved before the court. It is as distinct as if we should say that the court had a right to employ counsel to present John Smith before it. It looks like an effort to use the treaty and the fund provided for salaries of the commission and other officials in the employment of counsel to present cases involving American interests. The Chair does not know what those interests are which are referred to, but if they need counsel there ought to be another appropriation for that purpose. Hence the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the next item passed over is on line 6, page 23.

The Clerk read as follows:

Purchase and repairs, consular premises: For the acquisition of suitable premises or for the purchase of land and the erection thereon of a suitable building or of buildings in which to house the consulate general, the United States court, the jail, the post office, and other offices of the United States at Shanghai, China, including all necessary repairs, \$360,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. COX. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COOPER. Will not the gentleman reserve it?

Mr. COX. I will for a reasonable time.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I look upon this provision as one of the most important in the bill. It ought to pass. I think that the gentleman who reserved the point of order will withdraw it after he is made familiar with the facts upon which the Department of State bases its very urgent request for this appropriation. And therefore I intend to do no more than make as plain a statement as possible of the indisputable facts.

In 1913 China bought from other countries nearly \$430,000,000 worth of their products and sold to them \$306,000,000 worth of her own, her total foreign trade thus amounting to nearly \$740,000,000. Of this total foreign trade of China, the city of Shanghai alone did more than 42 per cent—nearly one-half. The imports into Shanghai alone were about \$180,000,000, and the exports through her port were nearly \$130,000,000, an aggregate of more than \$300,000,000. The increase in its foreign trade has been very remarkable. In 1880 the city's imports and exports amounted to only \$40,000,000; in 1898 they amounted to more than \$200,000,000, and in 1913 to more than \$300,000,000. The city has a population of about three-quarters of a million, and is by far the greatest commercial center not only in China but in all the Orient. I visited Shanghai a few years ago. I never shall forget our ride up that crowded river, nor the view of the broad, beautiful avenue along its shore, nor the astonishment with which all of our party looked at the Government-owned buildings occupied by the consular offices of Great Britain, Germany, France, and Japan, our chief commercial rivals, and at the hotels, club houses, banks—some of these being branches of great international banks—and at the many other interesting, attractive sights on that remarkable water front. The British Empire has a number of impressive structures there, including a beautiful cathedral and a fine consulate building. Germany also has such a building, Japan has one, France has one, and Russia is about to build a new one. All of the great nations except the United States have their consulates on that water front, with flags flying in plain view of the shipping from all parts of the world. But ours was on a back street in poor, shabby quarters, out of sight.

The representatives of our Government more than once told us that at times they had felt humiliated on hearing the comments made about our Government offices by oriental traders and other people who came to the American consulate to talk business. They assured us that an appearance of thrift, strength, prosperity always has much influence on the oriental mind, and especially when it is associated with the public offices of a foreign Government. And yet, in so far as its consulate and other public offices were concerned, the United States was by far the most poorly housed of any important nation represented at the great city of Shanghai.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I will.

Mr. MANN. I did not raise the point of order, because I would be quite willing to vote for the item; but in the Loudon Act which was passed we limited the cost of any embassy building to \$150,000, as the gentleman will remember. What special reason is there for this building or buildings to cost \$360,000?

Mr. COOPER. The question asked by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is the exact question I asked on first hearing of the proposed appropriation. But a careful study of the conditions and possibilities surrounding our consulate general at Shanghai, the chief port of all the Orient, made the answer plain. If the House will pardon a moment's delay, I will have the Doorkeeper bring in a map and a photograph belonging to the State Department, which show the international settlement on the water front of Shanghai. As I have said, I think that all that is needed to induce any gentleman to consent to a consideration of this proposition is that he acquaint himself with the indisputable facts of the case. At first I was opposed to the proposition, but the evidence—what I heard and read and had seen—convinced me that my opposition was wrong. In my judgment the urgent request of the State Department for this greatly needed appropriation ought to be granted at once.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I have no disposition to shut off the gentleman from Wisconsin, but I want to say that I am going to make the point of order.

Mr. MANN. I think we should have a short explanation of the matter.

Mr. COOPER. Has the gentleman from Indiana been requested to make this point of order?

Mr. COX. No; I did it of my own accord.

Mr. COOPER. Then I think that the gentleman will withdraw it after he understands all of the facts.

Mr. COX. I will not withdraw it, but I will withhold it.

Mr. COOPER. Does the gentleman know the reason why the State Department asked for this provision?

Mr. COX. I am well acquainted with the Loudon law, but my reason for making the point of order is this: When I see the receipts of the Treasury going down at the rate of a million dollars a day, and is now down to \$45,000,000, and I find here a provision exceeding the limit of cost by \$200,000, I make up my mind that it is not right. With all due deference to the gentleman, I desire to say that there is nothing personal in the matter. I intend to make the point of order, but I shall withhold it for a reasonable time.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, that exact point was urged before our committee. The gentleman from Indiana objects because, as he says, this would exceed the limit of cost set by the Loudon law. The complete answer to that objection is that the necessities and the possibilities of our situation at Shanghai are wholly exceptional. We have no such consulate problem elsewhere in the world—nothing comparable to it. Moreover, even in the midst of business depression, it is sometimes advisable for a man who sees a rare business opportunity to borrow money to meet it, because the near future will surely bring him fine dividends upon the investment. Twenty-five years ago Fifth Avenue, New York, was almost exclusively a residential street. If at that time, before the Waldorf Astoria was erected, or any other of the great structures that now adorn that splendid thoroughfare, a man had borrowed money to purchase property among those dwelling houses, most people, especially people who had not studied the subject, would have called him very foolish, whereas the record of events now abundantly demonstrates that he would have been very wise.

Mr. COX. I think there is an item in the bill appropriating \$2,400 a year rent for that purpose, and that would be much cheaper than any building would ever cost.

Mr. COOPER. But, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman should remember that that sum is a part of the rent for six houses situated on a part of the premises on the water front we now occupy and propose to purchase. These premises are directly between the consulate building of Germany and that of Japan.

Mr. Chairman, Germany, Great Britain, Japan, France, Russia, our great business competitors, all appreciate the fact that Shanghai is on the Whangpoo River, a stream that, with its tributaries, affords access to practically one-third of China, a country whose vast natural resources have but barely felt the touch of modern industrial methods.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, China is our friend. We gave back the Boxer money to China and in other ways have indicated our friendship for her. When an end comes to the war now raging in Europe, our chief commercial rivals will put forth tremendous efforts to capture the trade of China. Her foreign trade, now between \$700,000,000 and \$800,000,000 a year, is certain to be rapidly and greatly increased. A wonder-

ful change is coming over China. This change is of especial interest to me, because it seems like the fulfillment of a prophecy that I heard made a few years ago in China by a Chinaman. On a train going from Canton he informed me that he was an official of the railroad company and had been educated at Lehigh University, in this country. On my remarking that I had recently visited Japan and had been greatly impressed by the developments and transformations going on there, he said quietly, but with earnestness, "Yes, Mr. COOPER, we Chinamen know what Japan has done and is doing; we Chinamen have studied Japan, and we know why and how she is succeeding." Then, closing his hand in this fashion, he added: "And, I assure you, Mr. COOPER, that China is going to turn over." Coming from him, under such circumstances, that was an extraordinary expression—"China is going to turn over." So I said, "If you mean that China is going to turn over as Japan has turned over in the recent past by adopting modern methods, you have made a statement of startling significance. If, with your 400,000,000 of people, your skilled mechanics, and abundance of common labor, your iron mines, coal mines, and other rich natural resources as yet only a small fraction developed—if with all these you change as Japan has changed, you are to do something of profound concern to the whole world." He closed his hand, and, striking gently on the ledge of the open window, replied in his calm, forceful, Chinese way: "Yes; we know that, Mr. COOPER, and we know also that powerful influences are at work in opposition, but I assure you that China is going to turn over."

That was a strange prophecy. I reported it to some of my fellow travelers and they thought it the most significant utterance heard on the trip. It was a strange prophecy, but how soon it proved true. Only a brief time passed before we witnessed the overthrow of the Empire in China and the establishment of the Republic on its ruins. The vast "turn over" had begun. Mr. Chairman, China intends to turn over also by the adoption of modern industrial methods. She is our friend, as we are hers. China has \$700,000,000 worth of foreign trade, of which our share has been less than 10 per cent. That total of seven hundred millions is going to be developed into billions. It is the duty of statesmanship to be provident of the future. It is our duty to lose no opportunity in an honorable way to help put our country in as good a position as possible in the coming world struggle for the trade of China and the other nations of the Far East.

Along the shore of the river is this broad avenue, filled always by people from all over the globe.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin be permitted to conclude his remarks.

Mr. COX. Oh, no. How long does the gentleman want?

Mr. COOPER. That should make no difference. This is Saturday afternoon.

Mr. COX. But there is another bill to be considered this afternoon.

Mr. COOPER. There is nothing in that bill of more importance than is the proposition I am discussing.

Mr. COX. I understand there is another appropriation bill to come before the House this afternoon.

Mr. COOPER. Give me 15 minutes and there will be no objection.

Mr. COX. I am willing to allow the gentleman to proceed for 5 minutes, but I can not agree to 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman from Wisconsin proceeding for five minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Upon this water front [pointing to the map] there is what is called the international settlement, to which are confined by the law of China all foreign residents of Shanghai, including the representatives of foreign Governments. It is a very restricted area. The value of the property within it has gone up with exceeding rapidity during the last 20 years. There is remaining but one site upon this water front which we can buy—only one. We are now occupying it. As I have said, it is located directly between the German Government building and the Japanese Government building. During the course of his examination before our committee I asked Mr. Carr, the Director of the Consular Service of the United States, with whom the Members of the House are very favorably acquainted, if there were any particular reason, aside from the reasons given in the report of the State Department, why we ought to get that property now. He hesitated. I repeated the question, in substance, and he replied that unless we exercise our option and take this splendid location—absolutely the only

location left on that water front—and take it now, we are in very serious danger of losing it forever.

I said, "Who is after it?" Then, he gave the name of a steamship company belonging to a nation that is one of our great rivals for the trade of the Orient. So that if that steamship company should buy the property and locate itself between the consulate of Germany and the consulate of Japan, the United States of America will be forever barred from the magnificent water front in Shanghai.

Now, as to the price asked for the property. On this point the Department of State says:

The department has the assurance of the minister at Peking, the consul general at Shanghai, the American Association of China, and others, as to the reasonableness of the price at which the property has been held.

As an illustration of the reasonableness of the price asked for the property under option the consul general reports that the British firm of Hall & Holtz (Ltd.) has purchased about one-third of an acre of ground, together with the buildings thereon, on Nanking Road, Shanghai, for approximately \$170,000. This property is located about 400 feet from the river front and in what at present may be considered the best retail district of Shanghai. For consular or modern hotel purposes, however, such a location is not as desirable as the water-front location now occupied by the consulate general. The buildings on the Hall & Holtz property are of red brick and may be roughly estimated to be worth \$50,000, which, deducted from the total cost, leaves the valuation of the land at \$120,000, or approximately \$60,000 a mu. Estimated on the same valuation the land only which is now under option to the United States would be worth over \$336,000, but, as has already been stated, on the basis of the estimate of the overseer of taxes this land would be worth \$392,000.

We are now renting only about one-half of the floor space of all of the buildings on the property. Our option expires on the 4th of March. If that foreign steamship company takes the land, we are forever barred. Who does not know that when the war in Europe is ended the United States is going to meet with tremendous rivalry for the great trade certain to be developed in China? Business prudence—ordinary business prudence—demands that we do not lose this opportunity to own the very superior business site that we now occupy, the only site on that great water front possible for us to own, an opportunity that may be lost forever if we lose it now. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin be allowed to proceed for 15 minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to make the point of order of no quorum present, and I ask the gentleman to permit the gentleman from Wisconsin to go on. His speech is exceedingly interesting, and I think the gentleman will save time by giving him 15 minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be abrupt about this. I have served notice that I am going to make the point of order. The gentleman has had already 15 or 20 minutes, and there are other appropriation bills pressing here. However, if the gentleman from Illinois wants to be instrumental in losing time he must take the responsibility on himself.

Mr. MADDEN. I hope the gentleman will let the gentleman from Wisconsin have the 15 minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I have no disposition in the world to shut off the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER]. This is clearly subject to a point of order. The gentleman has now had 15 or 20 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. But the statement the gentleman is making now is important.

Mr. COX. But there is another appropriation bill coming in where there will be general debate, and the gentleman can come in on that.

Mr. MADDEN. But it will not be consecutive, and why not yield and permit the gentleman to have 15 minutes? We will not lose any more time by this than if the point of no quorum was made.

Mr. COX. I will withhold the point of order for five minutes, and at the end of that time I will make it. It is five minutes or nothing.

Mr. MADDEN. We want to hear what the gentleman from Wisconsin has to say. I hope the gentleman will do it. I would do as much for him.

Mr. CALDER. Suppose you make it eight minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Make it 10 minutes.

A MEMBER. Let us divide the time and make it seven and a half minutes.

Mr. COX. No; make it five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for seven and a half minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARRISON. Is it not within the discretion of the Chair to give as much time as he desires to listen—

The CHAIRMAN. No; the Chair has to rule on the point of order.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I will withhold my point of order for 10 minutes. [Applause.] At the end of that time I am going to make the point of order.

Mr. COOPER. I am greatly indebted to the gentleman from Indiana. Here is what the State Department said:

Unless, therefore, this Government is able to purchase the property the offices of the consulate general, upon the expiration of the present lease, must be removed to other quarters, and there are none on the water front and none near the business portion of the settlement to be found. The department has the assurance of the minister at Peking, the consul general at Shanghai, the American Association of China, and others as to the reasonableness of the price at which the property has been held. In 1907 the United States could have purchased suitable premises in the vicinity of the present consulate general for \$216,000. Since that date property in that neighborhood has risen in value. The reasons are two—the growth of the port and the restricted area of the district in which foreigners are permitted to reside.

The land assessments of 1907 showed an increase in the value of property in the vicinity of the consulate of twenty times that of 1880 and eight and one-half times that of 1890. This indicated to some extent the rate of growth.

This increase in price reminds us of the way in which the value of property has increased in the restricted loop district in Chicago, or along Fifth Avenue, or some of the other great thoroughfares in the city of New York. The circumstances in Shanghai are very exceptional. The city itself is surrounded by a stone wall, pierced by gates. This international settlement has a restricted area which can not be increased. Within this area the great business nations of the world have built business houses—consulates are business houses—diplomatic services are not performed in them; they are business houses. England, Germany, France, Japan, and Russia know the necessity of having government-owned consulates worthy of the dignity of the nation. We, the foremost of republics, destined, we hope, to become the foremost of all nations the wide world around, are going to seek a legitimate share of the foreign trade of the Far East, and therefore we need and ought to have a place on the water front in what is to be the London of the Orient [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for just a second?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. While the gentleman was speaking here, I was talking for a moment with Senator LEWIS, of Illinois, who made a trip to the Orient two or three years ago by direction of the State Department, and he said to me that it was an odd coincidence that while he was sitting over here, which is very rarely, Mr. COOPER was making a speech about a subject on which he had made a report, and he stated that the property that Mr. COOPER was talking about was of inestimable value to the United States.

Mr. COOPER. Did Senator LEWIS say that?

Mr. MANN. That is what he said just now, that he made a report upon it, and that it is worth many times to us what it could possibly cost now. That is what Senator LEWIS said.

Mr. COOPER. I have never, either directly or indirectly, had any communication with Senator LEWIS on the subject of our consulate at Shanghai, nor upon any other subject in anywise relating to the Orient. Until the gentleman from Illinois made his statement a moment ago I was not aware that Senator LEWIS had ever been in Shanghai. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] said, it is an odd coincidence that the Senator should come to this Chamber at this time. I am very glad to hear the gentleman from Illinois say that the Senator has visited Shanghai and is familiar with the subject I am discussing, and that in a recent report to the State Department the Senator declared that the location of our consulate on that water front in Shanghai is a thing of inestimable importance to the business of the United States.

This is not a proposition to throw away public funds. On the contrary, it is, as I say, a proposal to make a business investment that in the near future will yield profitable dividends. The great international business struggle of the future is to come in the Orient.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. COX. At what is this land assessed?

Mr. COOPER. I just read what the State Department says:

Estimated on the same valuation, the land which is now under option to the United States would be worth over \$336,000, but, as has already been stated, on the basis of the estimate of the overseer of taxes this land would be worth \$392,000.

Mr. COX. Has the gentleman information as to what this land is actually assessed at for taxation purposes now? I am informed it is assessed at \$108,000.

Mr. COOPER. Well, I know nothing about that. It may be, if the assessment is as it is in some cities of this country, at about a third or a quarter of the value. However, here is the estimate of the overseer of taxes that this land is worth \$392,000.

Mr. COX. Has he any interest in this property?

Mr. COOPER. None whatever.

Mr. COX. Has he ever testified on that point?

Mr. COOPER. But the China Realty Co.—

Mr. COX. Is he a member of the China Realty Co.?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Carr said, I believe, that none of the people who testified was interested in this property.

Mr. COX. Has the gentleman any information as to who constitutes the China Realty Co.?

Mr. COOPER. No; nor does that make the slightest difference. I am sure that our minister at Peking is not a member of that company. He strongly favors this proposition. I am sure that our consul general is not a member of that company, and that none of our consular officers is a member of it. All of these men strongly indorse this proposition, as does our Secretary of State and the Director of the United States Consular Service. I do not think that the American association in China are owners in this property. This association also indorses the proposition. And Senator Lewis, a Democratic Senator, who went to China on a mission for the State Department, came in here a few minutes ago and told the minority leader that as a result of his personal observation he considered it of inestimable importance that the United States Government should not lose this one chance to secure a business location in Shanghai, the greatest business city in all the Orient. This is not a party question. The United States ought not to lose an opportunity to make a wise investment, nor should the gentleman from Indiana if one presents itself to him.

Mr. COX. The "gentleman from Indiana" has no money to make any such investment.

Mr. COOPER. The same is true of the "gentleman from Wisconsin." My time is expiring. Before concluding, permit me to say that I have no knowledge as to who are the owners of this property. No person, directly or indirectly, ever has spoken to or had any communication with me on this subject—

Mr. COX. I think that is absolutely true.

Mr. COOPER. One moment. Except in the committee room, when all the members were present, and except that Mr. Carr and I made brief and mere casual reference to it when we chanced to meet for a moment at a recent reception at the Japanese Embassy.

Mr. COX. I entertain no doubt but that is absolutely true.

Mr. COOPER. I hope that the gentleman will withdraw the point of order. He certainly ought to do so. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I send an amendment to the desk, which I will ask the Clerk to report.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 27, by inserting in lieu of the paragraph headed "Exposition in city of Panama," the following:

"EXPOSITION IN CITY OF PANAMA.

"That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to accept an invitation extended by the Government of Panama to the Government of the United States to participate in an exposition to be held in the city of Panama; and the sum of \$25,000 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to enable suitable participation in said exposition by this country for an appropriate exhibit of the arts, industries, manufactures, products of the soil and the mines of the United States, and, as far as practicable, of the functions of the General Government, and an exhibit of such other articles as the President may direct, including an exhibit relating to the Panama Canal."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. If the gentleman wants to make a point of order, the point of order is good.

Mr. GOOD. I want to ask the gentleman a few words in regard to it. The naval appropriation bill appropriates \$104,000, as I understand, for a naval display at the opening of the canal. There is now pending a legislative appropriation bill that carries an item of \$160,000, and that item, if it passes the House as agreed to in the Senate, gives to the President the use of the vessels of the Navy and the transports, and the use of the Panama Railroad, which, I assume, includes the use of the hotels that are owned by the Panama Railroad Co. Here is \$264,000, with practically everything paid for by the Government throughout other appropriations for which we could be called upon to pay money. Now, \$25,000 is not a large sum, but I only want to inquire if this is to be used in addition to these other sums we have already been appropriating or for which the appropriation bills are pending?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. This is for a different purpose. This is to send an exhibit from this country to the Panama

Exposition, which opens on the 6th of July. The \$160,000 may be partly consumed in going through the canal at that time, partly consumed in taking distinguished Americans up to the San Francisco exposition and the other expositions in California, but this is for an entirely distinct purpose. It is to send an exhibit, and has nothing in it in the nature of an appropriation for trips for anyone.

Mr. GOOD. What is the object of reducing it from \$100,000 to \$25,000 if we are to make an exhibit that is to be at all—

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. We never intended to spend more than \$25,000 for the exhibit.

Mr. MANN. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] that the \$100,000 included \$75,000 for a permanent exhibition building in the city of Panama on the side of the city opposite to Balboa. I made a point of order on that provision on the ground that we did not need a permanent exposition building there, or that if we did the building ought to be located on the Canal Zone, on our own territory, and not located opposite, across the city, at a point in the opposite direction, where nobody would ever go to it hereafter. That is the reason for the reduction.

Mr. GOOD. My inquiry was whether or not \$25,000 would be sufficient to enable the Government to make a suitable exhibition of our arts and sciences in the exposition.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The estimate was made by the State Department for \$25,000 for this purpose, and \$75,000 for the purpose stated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that if we make any exhibit there at all, which may be somewhat doubtful, it is quite probable that the State Department will have the Panama Canal make some exhibition in regard to the Panama Canal, which would be paid out of this fund. I do not think there would be much else done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SIMS. May I inquire of the gentleman from Virginia what is to be the nature of this exhibition?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. An exhibit of the arts, industries, manufactures, products of the soil and mines of the United States, and, as far as practicable, of the functions of the General Government, and an exhibit of such other articles as the President may direct, including an exhibit relating to the Panama Canal.

Mr. SIMS. But the Government does not have any of those exhibits, does it?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It would have to get them up.

Mr. SIMS. Could it get them up from private industries and manufactures? Is not that a new departure?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I do not believe so.

Mr. SIMS. The Government exhibits heretofore have been confined to things in the National Museum and the Smithsonian Institution and things that pertain to the Government business.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The Government wants to make an exhibit that people traveling through the canal from all parts of the world may see and therefrom get some idea as to our resources.

Mr. SIMS. As to manufactures as well as other things?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. The Government would have to prepare those things?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes; from the \$25,000 appropriated.

Mr. MOORE. I do not think that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia provides for agricultural exhibits, does it?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes; for exhibits of products of the soil.

Mr. MOORE. It does not provide for products of the waters—fish and dried fish—which is a very important commodity in the South American countries?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. No.

Mr. MOORE. I am going to offer an amendment to cover that point, which I think the gentleman from Virginia will accept.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes; I will accept it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] withdraw his point of order?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; I withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment as follows: After the word "soil" insert a comma and strike out the words "and the" and after the word "mines" insert the words "and waters."

Mr. MOORE. That would mean, Mr. Chairman, that exhibits could be made of dried fish and other products of the waters of

the United States, which are used very extensively in tropical countries.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I accept the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting a paragraph from the letter of the British secretary of state for foreign affairs to the American ambassador in relation to our foreign trade, following up the statement I made this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill, with the amendments, to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LINTHICUM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 21201) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. FLOOD of Virginia, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. FERRIS, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of H. R. 6168, Sixty-third Congress, no adverse report thereon having been made.

MILITARY ACADEMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 21328) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 21328, the Military Academy appropriation bill.

Mr. HAY. And pending that, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman allow me a moment in which to make a request?

Mr. HAY. Certainly.

HOUSE OF MEETING ON MONDAY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, pending that I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-morrow it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday morning.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-morrow, Sunday, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday morning. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, it is now almost 3 o'clock. As I understand, there will probably be in the neighborhood of an hour's debate on the Military Academy bill?

Mr. HAY. About an hour.

Mr. MANN. And I suppose the fewer that are here considering the bill the more easily it will be passed. Is it the intention to adjourn either when we finish the Military Academy bill or after we have had the first reading of the fortification bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman in charge of the fortification bill [Mr. SHERLEY] may want to take it up and have it started, but not to do any work on it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MILITARY ACADEMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, pending my motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Military Academy appropriation bill, I ask unanimous consent that the general debate on this bill be confined to an hour, one-half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] asks unanimous consent that the general debate on this bill be limited to one hour, one-half to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the exercises in connection with the opening of the Panama-Pacific Exposition are taking place at the White House at this time. Mr. KAHN, necessarily, has gone to attend those exercises, and while the time may be allotted to him, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] will control it.

Mr. HAY. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] told me he would be away, but asked to have the division of time made in that way, and stated that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] would control it for him.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois rise?

Mr. FOWLER. I rose for the purpose of reserving the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. FOWLER. I want to know of the distinguished chairman of the committee if I may have 10 minutes.

Mr. HAY. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire 10 minutes on this bill, and I feel constrained to object unless I have some assurance that it will be allotted to me.

Mr. HAY. I will yield to the gentleman 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The motion of Mr. HAY was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 21328) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, with Mr. CULLOR in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE].

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the pension appropriation bill which passed yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the pension appropriation bill which passed yesterday. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER].

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, during this and the last session of Congress it has been the custom of the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle to inject into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD daily statements regarding the financial condition of the Treasury of the United States, many of which have been altogether imaginary or based upon false information. It has been repeatedly stated by these statesmen on the floor of the House that the Underwood bill was so unskillfully drawn that it has proven to be a failure as a revenue producer. I desire to call the attention of these gentlemen to a comparison of the revenue produced under the first fiscal year of the Underwood bill with that produced under the last two years of the Payne-Aldrich bill.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, the total ordinary receipts in round numbers for the first year of the Underwood bill amounted to \$734,000,000; while the total ordinary receipts for the fiscal year 1913 amounted to \$724,000,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, the total ordinary receipts amounted to \$691,000,000. It will thus be seen from these figures that the revenue for the first fiscal year under the Underwood bill amounted to \$10,000,000 more than the revenue

nue for the best year under the Payne-Aldrich bill. If the gentlemen on the other side would give more attention to the reports of the Treasury Department and less attention to the clamor of the special interests and false statements in the subsidized press, their public statements on the floor of this House might be more in harmony with the facts. The public prefers truth instead of falsehoods, and while the people are usually patient, yet, when they find that they have been outraged by deception and falsehood, they become more exacting in their demands for the causes prompting public servants in making misleading statements.

It is well known that all legislation is more or less a compromise. This applies to tariff measures the same as to other measures. I have no doubt but what the Payne-Aldrich bill was not altogether satisfactory to any of the men who voted for it. Mr. Payne himself was much disappointed and probably never recovered from the shock which was produced by the passage of that measure, which was to bear his name, because many changes were made after the first draft of the bill radically increasing the rates; yet he was compelled to submit to the majority sentiment of his party in Congress. It was the highest protective measure of all other tariff laws, and while Mr. Payne was not a radical advocate of a high protective tariff, yet he voted for the bill on its passage.

In the preparation of the Underwood bill the Democrats were divided on the question of tariff rates, and while the bill as it passed did not reflect in all of its parts the wishes of any of us, yet, as a whole, it was a reduction of the high rates carried in the Payne bill and in harmony with the promises which we made the people in advance of our election. I was in favor of retaining a reasonable rate on wool, sugar, and farm products, but the majority of our party decided otherwise, and as a revenue producer, if we may judge from the income of the first year of its life, it will produce under ordinary conditions ample revenue to meet the requirements of the Treasury. After paying all expenses of the Government we had \$34,000,000 left. The first year of all new tariff laws is usually the worst year, and it requires time for business conditions to adjust themselves to the new features of the law. The gentlemen who are denouncing the Underwood law as a free-trade measure well know that it was intended to be a revenue measure free from graft and special privileges. They well know that their criticism of this measure is unjust, and that the falling off of the revenue since July last is the result of the radical disturbance in commercial circles abroad. The European war is the greatest and most universal calamity known to man. The disturbance in the business and financial countries of Europe is much greater than in America.

The nations in the war zone are bankrupt and compelled to float loans frequently in order to bring sufficient revenue to defray the ordinary expenses of Government. Their business is paralyzed and their commercial relations with us is such that imports to this country from these sources has dropped down to a mere bagatelle. This being true no man of ordinary sense would dare to attribute the falling off of the revenue to the Underwood bill, because tariff revenues depend entirely upon imports from other countries.

It was not intended that the consumer should be taxed as heavily under the new tariff schedules as they had been under high-protective tariff law. We believe that the surplus millions in the hands of the idle and unscrupulous rich should bear at least a portion of the burden of taxation, and acting upon this just and humanitarian principle we provided for an income tax in the Underwood bill so that hereafter the rich will be compelled to pay a tax upon the never-ceasing stream of wealth which flows into their coffers as an income from the labor of the toiling many. I regard this feature of the Underwood bill as one of the safeguards not only to the Treasury but to the people of our country. We were able to incorporate this law in our tariff bill by virtue of the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution which was adopted by the various States of the Union.

Mr. Chairman, I have been so impressed with the virtue of the sixteenth amendment that I have embodied a few of my thoughts in some homemade poetry which I desire to recite:

THE SIXTEENTH AMENDMENT.

The right to levy an income tax
Had been upheld for a hundred years,
And more; but confronted with some facts,
Which bore evidence of many fears,
Lest their dividends might be impaired,
Should such tax be perpetuated,
The rich, in their wrath, boldly declared
That it must be exterminated.
The sixteenth amendment, hail, all hail!
Its triumph, resplendent, hail, all hail!

Such tax in the past had been confined
To cases of national distress,
But after it was clearly outlined
That tariff rates were used to oppress
The toiling many for the rich few,
It was clear that a change must be made
In our plan of raising revenue;
So wealth, its taxes could not evade.
The sixteenth amendment, hail, all hail!
Its triumph, resplendent, hail, all hail!

In our state of civilization,
It would be natural to expect
That no fraud or intimidation
Would be used at the polls to reflect
On elections by majority;
Yet, a rule, hatched up by party cliques,
Boldly claimed, without authority,
That ev'rything's fair in politics.
The sixteenth amendment, hail, all hail!
Its triumph, resplendent, hail, all hail!

Capital, by this base rule inspired,
Sought to corrupt the electorate,
And for this purpose secretly hired
An army of men, most desperate.
Their corrupt dealings with the voter
Coined such terms as "slush fund," "scoop the dive,"
"Ward heeler," "we have the dope," "floater,"
"Booster," "two-dollar bills," "blocks of five."
The sixteenth amendment, hail, all hail!
Its triumph, resplendent, hail, all hail!

The States, in righteous indignation,
Passed laws vote selling to disfranchise,
Which acted as a stimulation,
Honest elections to aggrandize.
The long struggle to enforce these laws
Slowly molded public opinion
In favor of the party whose cause
Promised reform in our dominion.
The sixteenth amendment, hail, all hail!
Its triumph, resplendent, hail, all hail!

The people, wrought up to a high pitch
During the campaign of ninety-two,
Mustering their forces against the rich,
Electing their ticket through and through;
Down went tariff rates in ninety-four,
With a righteous law, taxing incomes,
Which created a tremendous roar
Among proud masters owning big sums.
The sixteenth amendment, hail, all hail!
Its triumph, resplendent, hail, all hail!

For thirty years, the profits of toil
Had been reaped by capital combined,
But through bitter struggles of turmoil,
A new policy had been outlined,
Shifting the burden of taxation
From the backs of the unsupported,
To incomes on wealth valuation,
And on luxuries, when imported.
The sixteenth amendment, hail, all hail!
Its triumph, resplendent, hail, all hail!

Having been vanquished by the masses
In their fight for Federal control,
Appeal was taken by the classes
To the high court, the death knell to toll
Of the law which sought to penalize
Incomes by a tax of two per cent,
Because they began to realize
The weight of its far-reaching extent.
The sixteenth amendment, hail, all hail!
Its triumph, resplendent, hail, all hail!

Once in the hands of the Supreme Court
The task of the boss was quite easy;
According to a certain report,
Judicial air became right breezy.
But to be certain and leave no doubt
As to future administrations,
The court turned turtle and knocked it out,
In its final deliberations.
The sixteenth amendment, hail, all hail!
Its triumph, resplendent, hail, all hail!

Like fiends, rejoicing over revenge;
Like burglars, gloating over big spoils,
As the mantle of darkness descends
Upon the hutlet of him who toils,
The owners of mighty dividends,
In stately halls, assembled that night
To revel and rejoice with their friends,
And celebrate their vict'ry outright.
The sixteenth amendment, hail, all hail!
Its triumph, resplendent, hail, all hail!

The people, with sad hearts, heard the news,
And met in anxious groups ev'rywhere
To learn the facts and express their views;
While to some it was not very clear
What course was best for them to pursue
To regain the power they had lost,
All agreed their courage to renew
And push the fight, regardless of cost.
The sixteenth amendment, hail, all hail!
Its triumph, resplendent, hail, all hail!

Flushed with fresh Federal victory,
Capital laid plans very drastic
To debauch our country's history,
Its servants, with conscience elastic,
Passed the Dingley bill in ninety-seven,
Raising tariff rates so monstrous high
That the groans from the poor brought from Heaven
A painful look and a heavy sigh.
The sixteenth amendment, hail, all hail!
Its triumph, resplendent, hail, all hail!

Commercial business of the same kind,
Now organized in corporate groups,
With strict search everywhere to find
Business refusing to join the coups,
With the express purpose to destroy
All opposition that might be made
Against those who skillfully employ
Unlawful methods to control trade.
The sixteenth amendment, hail, all hail!
Its triumph, resplendent, hail, all hail!

The work of quick elimination
Against independents was imposed,
To crush, without discrimination,
All the business actively opposed
To the control of trade by masters.
Rebates, and fighting brands with coupons,
Produced in the markets disasters
From wholesales to retail of pecans.
The sixteenth amendment, hail, all hail!
Its triumph, resplendent, hail, all hail!

During the fight prices dropped quite low,
And the consumer was delighted;
Its real purpose he did not know,
Until rising prices were sighted.
Then he clearly saw the reason why
Independents, with their little stocks,
Were forced out of business, with a sigh,
As on their doors were placed sheriff's locks.
The sixteenth amendment, hail, all hail!
Its triumph, resplendent, hail, all hail!

With opposition out of the way,
Big business in the United States,
Worked out an ingenious game to play—
Called interlocking directorates.
It was new to the commercial world,
But, soon became quite fascinating,
As its splendid features were unfurled
In favor of wealth aggregating.
The sixteenth amendment, hail, all hail!
Its triumph, resplendent, hail, all hail!

Andy and John soon became experts,
And taught Bill, Nelson, and Sereno,
By many wise and foxy excerpts,
How to herd pigs, stocks, and Merino,
In roads, mines, and wells with much avail;
Long terms in Congress—nothing to fear.
Then they sang the "Highwayman" song, "Hail,
The gang's all here; what the hell d'we care!"
The sixteenth amendment, hail, all hail!
Its triumph, resplendent, hail, all hail!

Heretofore corporations had fought
Commercial battles single handed,
But now everything that is bought
Is made by the trusts, neatly branded.
Competition, like ghosts at daybreak,
Hath fled to secret quarters unknown,
Leaving the people their way to make,
Under cruel masters, overgrown.
The sixteenth amendment, hail, all hail!
Its triumph, resplendent, hail, all hail!

The people were not to be frightened
In their manly struggle for relief,
For they had seen their shackles tightened,
And their wives and children brought to grief.
To win with the ballot they must fight,
And not with glittering blades of gore,
For in struggles for causes of right,
Weapons of steel should be used no more.
The sixteenth amendment, hail, all hail!
Its triumph, resplendent, hail, all hail!

Like a chieftain from exile recalled,
The honor of his country to save,
The people, in bitter war enthralled,
Unearthed their brave leader from the grave,
Where for many long years he had slept
By a decision of five to four,
Rendered while our Supreme Court was kept
Quite busy writing protection lore.
The sixteenth amendment, hail, all hail!
Its triumph, resplendent, hail, all hail!

On raged the battle the country wide,
To settle the question at the polls;
From shop, hill and dale, and mountainside,
Came the steady tread of marching souls;
With features stern and purpose steady,
Straight to the polls they went to elect
A ticket of men who stood ready,
Honor on their country to reflect.
The sixteenth amendment, hail, all hail!
Its triumph, resplendent, hail, all hail!

Other types of men to the polls went,
With liquor to drench and money to buy,
Having in mind no other intent
Than the laws of the land to defy,
And politics to commercialize.
They issued political dictums,
Laid foul schemes, good men to terrorize,
And scoured the land for easy victims.
The sixteenth amendment, hail, all hail!
Its triumph, resplendent, hail, all hail!

In the basic laws i' the nation,
We carved his rights in living letters,
Beyond the reach of litigation,
And strange decrees of legal fetters.
Linked with the seventeenth amendment,
It's the greatest triumph of the age,
Making sure our fathers' intentment
That all in government should engage.
The sixteenth amendment, hail, all hail!
Its triumph, resplendent, hail, all hail!

It's the harbinger of a new day,
The beginning of a new system,
Compelling the rich a tax to pay
On their incomes and truly list them.
It lifts from the shoulder of labor
Some of the burden of taxation,
And places them on our rich neighbor
To worry him with sore vexation.
The sixteenth amendment, hail, all hail!
Its triumph, resplendent, hail, all hail!

[Applause.]

Mr. HAY. Will the gentleman from Kansas use some of his time?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. J. M. C. SMITH].

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, by placing therein the platform adopted by the Republican State convention recently held in Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the document which he names. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, under the permission granted me by the House, I wish to have printed in the RECORD the platform unanimously adopted by the Republican State convention held at the city of Grand Rapids, in the State of Michigan, on the 12th day of February, 1915. The platform embodies a clear exposition of the principles of the Republican Party; is a keynote for its future course, a succinct statement of its splendid fitness and capacity, and exposé of present conditions, with the reasons therefor:

A VIGOROUS KEYNOTE PLATFORM.

The platform adopted by the Republican State convention is as follows:

We, the Republicans of the State of Michigan in convention assembled, appealing to the record of matchless achievements of half a century of triumphant progress under Republican rule, confidently address ourselves to the awakened conscience of an intelligent electorate.

First. For the second time since the Civil War the American people have witnessed the calamitous consequences of Democratic inefficiency that has closed factories, increased bankruptcies, reduced bank deposits, lowered wages, crippled production, destroyed confidence, decreased revenue, increased deficits, and increased appropriations, a record of unparalleled incapacity, violated pledges, and disastrous policies, which makes it the plain duty of all right-thinking Americans to rescue the administration of national affairs from a party incapable of progressive legislation and content with psychological depression, watchful waiting, and masterly inactivity.

Second. We condemn the Democratic administration for its hypocrisy, deceit, and broken promises. It has violated every pledge in its national platform and broken faith with the people.

We point to the disastrous consequences of unintelligent tariff tinkering. Instead of lowering the cost of living, its cost has been increased. Instead of the laboring man being the chief sufferers under high tariff, he is the first and chief sufferer under low tariff. Instead of prosecuting trust violators, the Attorney General's office is given over to spoils-men, and the most flagrant violators go unwhipped of justice. The professed champion of State rights, it arbitrarily interfered with the internal affairs of Michigan. It favored one term for President, but now explains that this does not apply to Wilson. It charged the Republican Party with extravagance, and has greatly increased appropriations. It condemned the Aldrich currency plan, but adopted its essential features. Pledged to exempt American vessels from Panama Canal tolls, it meekly bowed to Great Britain and stood sponsor for a repudiation of its own promises. Pledged to preserve and strengthen the civil service, it repealed essential features of the law and filled the Government offices with inexperienced and inefficient party followers, and now proposes to sell the rural delivery of mail to the highest bidder, while Bryan frantically demands, even of the Diplomatic Service, more jobs for his political henchmen.

This party which has proved recreant to every trust, arrested national development, halted progress, ruined credit, impoverished labor, and subjected American citizenship to the sneers of every nation on earth ought to be and will be driven from power and the administration of affairs returned to the only party that has kept pace with the progress of the centuries.

Third. We renew our faith in the principles of protection as the solid basis of industrial achievement, prosperity, and independence—a policy which taxes foreign products marketed in competition with our own, which encourages home industries, raises needed revenue from foreign goods, secures the American market to the American people, upholds the high standard of American wages, builds the factory beside the farm, creates agricultural enthusiasm, stimulates industry, encourages inventive genius, diversifies occupations, diffuses thrift, and builds up, strengthens, and ennobles American independence, civilization, and character.

We denounce the revenue legislation of the present administration as the product of party incompetency, unscientific methods, sectional discrimination, and individual favoritism, destructive alike to American business and American enterprise. It has lowered wages, closed factories, and reduced thousands of useful laborers to want. Where to get bread, not where to get men, is the present paramount issue.

Fourth. As we favor industrial protection and freedom, so we favor national protection and independence. We therefore demand the strengthening of our coast defenses, the upbuilding and maintenance of an adequate American Navy, the complete fortification and control of the Panama Canal, the reorganization of the National Guard, the increase of the Regular Army to such size as at all times to adequately garrison all necessary fortifications, as the best means of protecting our territory, property, and people.

Fifth. While we favor reform where reform is needed, the present need is to reestablish an American policy, restore confidence, replenish the Public Treasury, repeal the iniquitous internal-revenue measures, reestablish credit, replace the sign "To let" with "Help wanted," reopen the door of opportunity, and give to American labor "an honest dollar and a chance to earn it."

We commend the attitude and tireless exertions of Senators SMITH and TOWNSEND in opposing by every fair means the attempt of the administration to force upon our people the iniquitous "ship-purchasing bill," and recommend that the secretary of this convention wire to Senators SMITH and TOWNSEND a copy of this paragraph.

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield as much time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER].

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the Post Office Department, the ship-purchase bill, and H. R. 13769.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subjects named by him. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWNSEND].

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in relation to a resolution now before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I send to the Clerk's desk a petition to be read, and I ask permission to have the names inserted in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

A PETITION TO CONGRESS FOR THE UNEMPLOYED OF AMERICA.

To the honorable the Congress of the United States.

GENTLEMEN: To the end that relief may be found for the millions of unemployed throughout the Nation, we earnestly urge upon you and the Members of your honorable body that this matter be given precedent over every other possible measure, and that action along the following or similar lines be taken at the earliest possible moment:

First. That a comprehensive system of Federal, State, and municipal free employment agencies be established. Such a system was outlined by Congressman MURDOCK, of Kansas, in his bill introduced in Congress April 29, 1914. Either this measure or some similar measure should be adopted at once.

Second. That every possible line of public works now owned and operated by the Government be at once extended and new ones opened so as to give work to the unemployed. The Government should build more roads, push the work on its reclamation, irrigation, and deforesting projects, open more mines, and inaugurate public enterprises and industries.

Third. That provision be made for loans by the United States Government to the various States and municipalities, at a rate of interest sufficient only to cover the cost of handling the money, in order to enable such States and municipalities to develop public works of their own, and thus employ their proportion of the unemployed.

Fourth. That Congress proceed at once to develop and put in operation a national system of unemployment insurance, by which the workers of the Nation may be protected from involuntary idleness.

Fifth. And finally that a sufficient appropriation be made out of any available funds to put into operation at once the above measures.

Most respectfully submitted.

J. B. Carpenter, B. E. Bacon, G. H. Bacon, T. J. Johnson, W. J. Koer, J. F. Wakefield, J. R. Smith, G. R. Hamer, W. G. Newson, B. F. Laymann, W. Stedder, Rufe Akins, J. Tom Daniel, Eliger Esping, E. R. Derrick, S. Z. Rose, J. T. Dickson, E. M. Vinson, F. W. Lyon, James Lyon, John Lyon, Walter Lyon, J. S. Brackett, A. H. Doescher, Will Pierce, S. C. Witt, F. N. Eldridge, Joe Robson, Glenn Duckett, Arthur Phillips, I. H. Peterman, J. C. Hensly, G. W. Smith, Geo. Cunningham, W. J. Hurd, C. W. Powell, T. C. Carpenter, J. A. Turner, R. W. Turner, Tom Turner, J. S. Tindel.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] 20 minutes.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words about the filling of vacancies in the Corps of Cadets at West Point. Under the law each congressional district is entitled to have a cadet at West Point and each State, on the nomination of the Senators, 2 in addition; the District of Columbia has 2; Porto Rico and Alaska, 1 each; and the Secretary of War is authorized to permit not exceeding 4 Filipinos to be designated, 1 for each class. Besides these, the President appoints from the United States at large 40. Under a provision in the Military Academy act of 1910 Members of Congress make their appointments once in three years—that is to say, as soon as a cadet representing any district or State has completed three years of his course another appointment from that district or State may be made. This and the increase of Members of Congress by the last apportionment has brought the total authorized strength of the corps of cadets to about 700. It varies somewhat from year to year with the variation in the number of cadets in the graduating class. For the past 10 years there has been a considerable number of vacancies, varying from 42 in 1904 to 129 in 1909. Last year there were 82 and in 1913 there were 80.

I have introduced a bill—H. R. 21449—which will give the President the authority to fill all vacancies from the whole list of alternates, selected in the order of merit established at the entrance examinations. The same bill has been introduced in the Senate by Senator CHAMBERLAIN, chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, and it has the warm support of the Secretary of War. I believe that bills of somewhat similar character have been introduced in this House before, and in talking with members of the Committee on Military Affairs I have been met with the objection that if this bill were to become law it would prevent a Member of Congress from making an appointment from his district after his boys had failed at the examination. This objection has been phrased usually something like this: "If my principal and alternates fail, that makes a vacancy from my district. Now, suppose the President fills it; then there is not any vacancy to fill, and I am deprived of a chance to make another appointment."

Mr. Chairman, I want to show conclusively that this argument is not valid. The bill distinctly says:

The admissions thus made shall be credited to the United States at large, and shall not interfere with or affect in any manner whatsoever any appointment authorized by existing law; and whenever by the operation of this or any other law the Corps of Cadets exceeds its authorized maximum strength as now provided by law, the admission of alternates as prescribed in this act shall cease until such time as said corps may be reduced to its present authorized strength.

It seems to me that those words clearly mean that if the President should fill a vacancy caused by the failure of my appointees, principal and alternates, to qualify, I could go right ahead and designate another principal and two more alternates for the next examination; but in order to be sure that that construction should be placed upon the words quoted I had the bill submitted to the Judge Advocate General, who has rendered an opinion "that the enactment of the proposed bill will in no way deprive any congressional district of its representation at the United States Military Academy as authorized by laws now in force." It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this opinion settles the matter.

The Military Academy, where the selected boys, to become officers in the Army of the United States, are educated and trained, is one of the most beautifully located institutions in the world. West Point is situated in the heart of the Highlands of the Hudson, and was a fortified post of great importance during the American Revolution. The existence, amid the highlands and mountains, at a considerable elevation above the river, of a remarkable level plain, which forms the parade ground of the Military Academy and is the site of its principal buildings, was noted by Gen. Washington and other leaders of the Revolution, and determined the selection by Washington of this point as the most available site for America's National Military Academy. There the Government of the United States has gradually developed a great plant, representing an investment of many millions of dollars. In recent years the Military Academy has largely been made over by the erection of many beautiful and splendid buildings, and much money has been spent in road building and grading, and so forth.

Our National Military Academy is a great university in number and variety of its buildings and extent of its grounds, and it seems to me very unfortunate and very bad business management that it is not working to its full capacity. If you were to go to West Point to visit it to-day, and were shown through the cadet quarters or barracks, you would find many vacant rooms, with beds standing ready but no one occupying them, and when you visited the lecture rooms and recitation rooms you would find seats and desks unoccupied, all because certain districts are not represented. Perhaps these districts are so located that few boys in them care for Army life. West Point's attractions are either unknown to them or do not appeal to them. Perhaps, again, boys have been appointed but have failed, or the cadets representing some districts may have been compelled to leave because of illness or some disqualification during their course. Even if all vacancies were filled and the academy should begin each year with a full quota, there would develop during the year a certain number of vacancies. In an institution of 700 students the number of vacancies that would naturally occur during the year would probably amount to 40 or 50. Vassar College, which is limited to a thousand students, admits each year about 1,060 in order to keep all vacancies filled, and has a large waiting list besides. I think this is true of other institutions which are limited to a certain number of students. If the number of vacancies occurring from natural causes in West Point is about 50, and we may allow 30 more for districts in which it is not easy to obtain candidates, the President could fill about 80 vacancies every year without running over the present authorized strength of the Corps of Cadets and without interfering in the least with the rights of appointment of any Member of Congress.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. Certainly.

Mr. GARDNER. As I understand the gentleman's bill, it allows the President to appoint cadets whenever there are vacancies; but that does not interfere with the Congressman appointing his cadet on top of the President's filling the vacancy.

Mr. PLATT. That is true.

Mr. GARDNER. Suppose the President has filled all of these vacancies, and 25 or 50 Congressmen appoint cadets who pass examination, then there will be 50 more cadets than the present authorized strength.

Mr. PLATT. There would be if the appointments were made right away.

Mr. GARDNER. As I understand, the academy is large enough to accommodate all those extra cadets as well.

Mr. PLATT. No doubt about it.

Mr. GARDNER. So, even if the gentleman's bill was subject to the complaint that was made that this would amount to an increase in the number of cadets authorized, the facilities are all there to take care of them?

Mr. PLATT. That is certainly true; and this bill authorizes the increasing of the strength temporarily. When vacancies are filled, the President ceases from making the appointments from among the alternates. But the authorized strength varies from year to year; it is not a fixed number.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman inform the committee as to the capacity of the buildings at West Point?

Mr. PLATT. The superintendent says that they can accommodate 700 very comfortably, and they can take care of more. I understand new buildings are being constructed with the purpose of accommodating 1,400 in the future.

Mr. STAFFORD. So as to provide, as in the Naval Academy, appointments every two years instead of every four years.

Mr. PLATT. I have heard it so stated. Some buildings constructed with that purpose in view are already finished.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. I will.

Mr. GOULDEN. Knowing that West Point is in the gentleman's district, I know that he is well informed. Will he tell us how many Congressmen failed to make appointments during the term? I know there are several vacancies existing, and they are frequently caused by Members of Congress failing to make appointment, especially if a principal has failed and alternates are not named, and so the fault lies with Congress rather than with the law.

Mr. PLATT. Vacancies for the past 10 years have averaged on September 1 from 42 to 129. For the first few years they ran from 42 to 51, and then they jumped up to 117, 129, 122, and then they fell back again to 57. In 1913 there were 80, and this report gives 87 on June 30, 1914; but the Secretary of War in a letter to me has stated that there were 82 in that year, so I suppose that 5 boys got in somehow during the summer.

Mr. GOULDEN. I would like to have the gentleman include in his statement the number of vacancies existing and the cause of the vacancies.

Mr. PLATT. I do not know that I could give all the causes.

Mr. GOULDEN. I think the Secretary of War can give them.

Mr. PLATT. The 82 vacancies on September 1st last were doubtless nearly all due to failure to appoint qualified boys, and they had increased to 112 in January last, due to illness, failure at examinations, etc., during the half year.

Mr. HAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. Certainly.

Mr. HAY. I understood the gentleman to say that the Military Academy could accommodate how many?

Mr. PLATT. The superintendent says 700.

Mr. HAY. He said in the hearings 732.

Mr. PLATT. In his report he says that the academy can accommodate 700 comfortably.

Mr. HAY. And he says that the buildings as they now exist can accommodate 732; that is, he can put those into the barracks. But I understood the gentleman's bill to provide that the number of cadets should be twice as many.

Mr. PLATT. Oh, no; that is another bill. My bill gives authority to the President only to fill vacancies from among the alternates.

Mr. STEENERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. Yes.

Mr. STEENERSON. Is not the reason for the vacancies the fact that if all the appointees and alternates fail in the district the appointment can not be made until the following scholastic year, but under the gentleman's plan the vacancies would be filled at once by persons who have passed the examination? That is the philosophy of the gentleman's bill.

Mr. PLATT. That is it exactly.

Mr. STEENERSON. So it makes a continuous membership of full strength, while under the present law as it operates there are vacancies.

Mr. ESCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. Yes.

Mr. ESCH. Why should there be 80 vacancies in 1914 when appointees can now enter upon a certificate of graduation?

Mr. PLATT. The physical examination accounts for a good many.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. I wanted to ask the gentleman if his bill provides that the President shall appoint cadets from the district where the vacancy exists?

Mr. PLATT. They are to be credited to the United States at large, but are to be taken from the alternates designated from districts.

Mr. ANTHONY. But not necessarily to be appointed from the district where the vacancy exists?

Mr. PLATT. No; it does not interfere with the vacancy at all. The Congressman can fill that later.

Mr. ANTHONY. It occurs to me that it would strengthen the bill if the President were to appoint some one from that district.

Mr. GARDNER. Oh, no; if that were in my district, I should be very careful to see that my first boy failed, and then when the President had appointed one I would get another to succeed.

Mr. PLATT. Yes; and in that way you would get more than you were entitled to.

Less than 50 per cent of the active Army officers are graduates of the Military Academy at West Point—it was stated in the report of the Superintendent of the Military Academy in 1914 as 44 per cent—and the Army needs the service of all the young men who can be trained at West Point. In case of any emergency, even a very mild one like a war with Mexico, it would need a great many more. The expenses of maintaining the United States Military Academy are a little over a million dollars a year. The present bill carries \$1,037,983.37, and there would be scarcely any perceptible increases if the academy were filled to its capacity. Everyone knows that a manufacturing plant is losing money if not working all its machinery full time, and everyone who has had any connection with a private boarding school conducted for profit knows how much money it can lose if its rooms are not kept full. The rooms are there and the number of instructors has to be just the same as if all were occupied. The only difference in expense is the comparatively trifling one of board.

There is another very strong reason why this bill, which would enable the President to fill vacancies from the list of alternates designated, should pass and that is this: Since the issue of General Orders, No. 3, and General Orders, No. 38, which allow boys to enter the United States Military Academy at West Point without taking the entrance examination, alternates designated by Members of Congress in many cases have no chance whatever of obtaining admission, and it is exceedingly difficult to get them to even take the examinations. I designated a principal and two alternates to West Point as a result of a competitive examination on the Rhodes scholarship plan. In this examination the boys not only answered questions on all the subjects required in the regular West Point examination, but they were examined physically and their school athletic records and general physical development counted toward the result. The physical examination was competitive as well as the mental, which made it really a more severe test in most respects than the physical examination for entrance, which is simply an examination to discover defects. The boy who won this competitive examination was not only well developed physically but he had a good record as a track athlete, and as he was already entered in Cornell University was practically sure of entrance at West Point, barring accident. The alternates had no chance. Under General Orders, No. 3, as modified by General Orders, No. 38, boys who have already been admitted to college or who present properly attested certificates of graduation from a high school or preparatory school in courses covering the West Point requirements do not have to take the entrance examination. There is no chance of failing to enter except on physical examination, and if boys are appointed as a result of a competitive physical examination even that chance is reduced to a minimum. Now, why designate alternates at all if they are to be wholly without hope? It seems to me that the passage of this bill is absolutely necessary in order to give them an inducement to take the entrance examination. In the examinations of March and May, 1914, 52 alternates qualified for whom no vacancies existed. Every one of them could have been admitted if this bill had become a law, but if this bill were passed a great many more would take the examination, and instead of having only 52 there would probably be 152 or more from whom to choose those of highest standing.

It seems to me therefore, Mr. Chairman, that from every point of view we should pass this bill and bring the number of cadets at our splendid Military Academy up to its full strength. [Applause.]

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. LAFFERTY].

[Mr. LAFFERTY addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the practice under the rules of the House is for petitions to have a notation made in the Record stating that they have been filed, and giving the names of the committees to whom they have been referred. A concurrent resolution adopted by the legislature of a sovereign State is entitled to be printed in full in the Record. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] has kindly yielded me sufficient time to read a concurrent resolution adopted by our State legislature, now in session at Bismarck. It is upon the subject of the disposition by the Government of the remaining public land in the different States and deserves the most careful consideration of this House. The concurrent resolution reads as follows:

Whereas when North Dakota was admitted to statehood the State was given for State institutions by the Federal Government lands aggregating 500,000 acres. This land was divided among the various State institutions, and as these lands are sold the moneys derived from them go into a permanent fund, the income of which is used and shall be used for the maintenance and support of the institution for which these lands stand as an endowment; and

Whereas there is in North Dakota to-day about 700,000 acres of vacant Government land remaining, much of which is subject to the 320-acre homestead, and may be subject to a homestead entry of 640 acres, provided a bill now before Congress shall be enacted into law; and

Whereas if this shall be done the remaining public lands in North Dakota will only provide a little over 1,000 homesteads; and

Whereas if Congress should enact a law giving to every public land State 500,000 acres of the remaining vacant public lands in the various public-land States, thereby benefiting all of the people of those States, and in a way in which and by which they would derive a much greater benefit than were the lands open for homesteads to a few: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring), That we respectfully request and petition the Congress of the United States, through our Senators and Representatives in Congress, that a law be enacted so that the States receiving these public lands shall be authorized through their legislatures to distribute the lands so given between the penal, charitable, and educational institutions of the State, but providing that one-fifth of the lands so given shall be set aside by the legislature as an endowment fund, the interest from which, when the lands shall have been sold, to be used for the purpose of building roads and bridges in the various States.

A. P. HANSON,
Speaker of the House.
ALBERT N. WOLD,
Chief Clerk of the House.
J. H. FRANE,
President of the Senate.
M. J. GEORGE,
Secretary of the Senate.

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Thomas Hall, secretary of state of the State of North Dakota and keeper of the great seal thereof, hereby certify that the attached is a true and correct copy of a certain concurrent resolution adopted by the Fourteenth Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, and the whole of such resolution.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State, at the capitol, in the city of Bismarck, this 16th day of February, A. D.

[SEAL.]

THOMAS HALL, Secretary of State.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment under the five-minute rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of cadets, \$390,000, \$10,000 of which — made immediately available.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, there is a typographical error in which the "h" is left out of the word "which" and the word "is" is omitted. I ask unanimous consent that they may be inserted by the Clerk, so as to make it read:

For pay of cadets, \$390,000, \$10,000 of which is made immediately available.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That until the apportionment under the Fourteenth Census of the United States becomes effective, whenever any cadet shall have finished three years of his course at the academy his successor may be admitted.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the proviso.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, five years ago, in 1910, this law was passed, and was to be in effect for five years. That period has now expired, and if we do not continue it one-fourth of the cadets in the academy will be cut off. In other words, we now appoint a cadet every three years under this provision.

Mr. STAFFORD. I knew that the new method of appointment every three years was in force, but I wondered whether the carrying out of this provision would increase the enrollment so that there would not be accommodations for the cadets?

Mr. HAY. No. It does not increase from where it is now. It simply permits us to do what we have been doing for the last five years.

Mr. STAFFORD. And the effect of the law of five years ago has been to increase the number at the academy?

Mr. HAY. By one-fourth, yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For extra pay of two enlisted men employed as clerks in the office of the commandant of cadets, at 50 cents each per day, Sundays and holidays included, \$366.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In the paragraph preceding this one it says "Sundays and legal holidays included." That is in the existing law, and in this paragraph you insert "Sundays and holidays included," but on the next page, in lines 19 and 20, on page 8, and again on page 9 you leave out what is now in the law, "Sundays and holidays included." I wondered if it were necessary to put those words in; and if it is, should they not be restored in those places where they now are in the existing law and left out of the bill?

Mr. HAY. I think they ought to be put in, because these men work on Sundays and legal holidays. I do not know how they happened to be left out. I think they ought to be put in, and when we get to the proper place I will ask that that be done.

The Clerk read as follows:

For extra pay of four enlisted men as assistants and attendants at the library, at 50 cents each per day, \$732.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, on page 8, line 20, by inserting after the word "day" the words "Sundays and holidays included."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 20, after the word "day," insert the words "Sundays and holidays included."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For extra pay of one enlisted man employed in the department of civil and military engineering, at 50 cents per day, \$157.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Now, that amount does not include Sundays and legal holidays. It probably is the correct amount. If the amount is right, the item is right.

Mr. HAY. I do not think holidays and Sundays are included in this.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of mechanic assistant in department of natural and experimental philosophy, \$1,000.

Mr. MANN. There is a typographical error in line 17, page 11.

Mr. HAY. I move to amend by adding the letter "l" at the end of line 17, page 11.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 17, page 11, amend at the end of line 17 by adding the letter "l."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Repair and purchase of cooking utensils, chairs, tables, and other furniture in the cadet mess, and the replacement of same, to be expended without advertising, to be immediately available, \$3,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. There are many of these items in this bill where they make a deficiency appropriation by making certain amounts immediately available. The gentleman from Virginia is very careful about his appropriation bills, but of course it is a very difficult thing for the clerks who compile the appropriations of the amounts appropriated for this fiscal year and the next fiscal year to make up any accurate statement where so many deficiency appropriations appear in the regular appropriation bills in this way. The gentleman appreciates that undoubtedly, or perhaps he does not fully appreciate it. I think if the gentleman fully appreciated the difficulty which the clerks have in making up the amounts of the appropriations for this fiscal year and then for the next fiscal year he would not insert so many

deficiency items in the bill, but would make the people go to the deficiency committee for them.

Mr. HAY. I will say to the gentleman that wherever we ask that part of an appropriation or all of it be made available, it is at the request of the superintendent of the academy.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to the appropriations being made immediately available, or making them a deficiency appropriation. In a good many cases you say so much shall be immediately available. Now, that so much is a deficiency appropriation, and it is almost impossible for the clerks of the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate, who make up their final statements of amounts appropriated for each fiscal year, to pick these items out.

Mr. HAY. That is true; I appreciate that.

Mr. MANN. That is one reason why we are usually quite careful about it to see that deficiencies appear in the deficiency bill, where they can be noted. I call attention to it, of course. I do not intend to make the point of order, but it makes it very difficult for anybody to keep track of how much of appropriations is for one year and how much is for another year.

Mr. HAY. I think there is a great deal in what the gentleman says, and perhaps hereafter it might be a wise thing to tell these gentlemen to go to the Committee on Appropriations and get their deficiency.

Mr. MANN. I think it would be. There is no trouble about getting the money.

Mr. HAY. Occasionally, if it can be done, it had better be done by going to the Committee on Appropriations. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if in regard to this particular item it was not stated that it was necessary to make this immediately available on account of the enlarged class that is coming in before this appropriation would be available?

Mr. HAY. That is true.

Mr. MANN. I was not referring especially to this item.

Mr. HAY. I understand the gentleman's objection was that they should ask their appropriations from the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws the point of order.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill as amended, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CULLOP, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 21328, and had directed him to report the same with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendments.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HAY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carr, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the reports of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House of Representatives to bills of the following titles:

S. 7213. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 7402. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; and

S. 6980. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 18745. An act in relation to the location of a navigable channel of the Calumet River, Ill.; and

H. R. 15557. An act for the relief of Anna Miller.

FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 21491, a bill making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, and for other purposes; and, pending that motion, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if we can have an agreement as to general debate.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER] is temporarily out of the Chamber on business, and I understand he has requests for four and a half hours.

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, the gentleman appreciates that at this time in the session it is not practical to have that much general debate on a side.

Mr. MANN. Well, no; I really think we could have it, as far as that is concerned. We are very well fixed in reference to the appropriation bills.

Mr. SHERLEY. I talked informally with the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER], and suggested to him what I thought was a very liberal agreement—two hours and a half to a side.

Mr. MANN. I will say to the gentleman there are bona fide requests, and I do not see how it is possible to get along without three and a half hours on this side. That cuts me out entirely, as I had requested some time, but I am willing to waive it.

Mr. SHERLEY. I appreciate that; but right after the conclusion of this bill it is proposed to bring in the general deficiency bill, and the House will soon be called upon to consider conference reports, and I submit—

Mr. MANN. But the general deficiency bill, of course, probably will not take very much time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We expect to be able to go on Wednesday with the general deficiency bill.

Mr. MANN. If we go ahead Monday we would undoubtedly be able to pass the fortifications bill Tuesday or Wednesday, unless something intervenes. That puts us in good shape as to the appropriations. I hope the gentleman will let us have three hours and a half on this side.

Mr. SHERLEY. I will compromise with the gentleman on three hours on a side.

Mr. MANN. I say I hope the gentleman will let us have three hours and a half. We have requests for four hours and a half.

Mr. SHERLEY. I appreciate that; but the gentleman understands that the requests are always way beyond the possibility of the House to grant.

Mr. MANN. We usually hold them down. I do when they come to me.

Mr. SHERLEY. My understanding from my conversation with the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER] was that he might get along with two hours and a half. I will make it three hours in view of that fact.

Mr. MANN. Make it three hours and a quarter.

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, call it three hours and a quarter. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate shall be for six hours and a half, half of that time to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER] and half of it by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks, pending the motion to go into committee, that general debate on the fortifications bill be limited to six hours and a half, one half to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER].

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman whether he is going to be prepared to answer questions when he presents this bill to the House?

Mr. SHERLEY. I hope to be able to present the bill to the House and give it such information as I am capable of doing.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman allow me to question him when he presents the bill to the House?

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, I do not know that I think it is proper to make any agreement about what I will or will not do. I have usually tried to be fair with the House and shall continue to try to be fair.

Mr. GARDNER. Yes; but the gentleman told me this morning that he did not propose to open the address in the usual way, as I saw he did last year; that he was going to close the debate, which would not allow me to ask him any questions.

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARDNER. How many does it take to constitute a quorum?

The SPEAKER. It takes 213.

Mr. GARDNER. Now does the gentleman from Kentucky want the regular order?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do.

Mr. GARDNER. I raise the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts raises the point of order that there is no quorum present, and evidently there is not.

Mr. SHERLEY. I move a call of the House, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky moves a call of the House.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division. The gentleman will not gain anything by this, I warn him.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 33, noes 2.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARDNER. Is it in order to move to adjourn?

Mr. FOSTER. Not when the House is dividing.

Mr. GARDNER. I have asked the question of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is.

Mr. GARDNER. I move to adjourn, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, in order that we may get a quorum here, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to adjourn. It amounts to the same thing as a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks for the yeas and nays on the motion to adjourn. All in favor of the motion will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Thirty-three gentlemen have risen in the affirmative, not a sufficient number.

Mr. ADAMSON. The other side, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Those opposed to taking this vote by the yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] There does not seem to be anyone rising. Thirty-three gentlemen rose in the affirmative, not a sufficient number.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, one-fifth of those present orders the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. One-fifth of those present orders the yeas and nays, provided—

Mr. CRISP. That is the proposition before the House.

Mr. ADAMSON. I asked for the other side and nobody objected.

The SPEAKER. Nobody rose.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Then the Speaker must count the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count the House.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. GARNER. To suggest to the Chair, if the Chair will permit, that in taking the question of whether or not we shall have the yeas and nays, under the Constitution it is not necessary for the Chair to count the other side unless it rises, and 33 gentlemen have risen in favor of the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows; but it is necessary for the Chair to observe the rules. The rule of the House is "one-fifth of those present."

Mr. GARNER. But, Mr. Speaker, when you called the other side and no one rose, then certainly you have more than one-fifth of those present indicating their desire.

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows; but he can see. The Chair will count to see how many there are here. [After counting.] Sixty-three Members are present, and 33 voted to take this vote by the yeas and nays. That is a sufficient number, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on agreeing to the motion to adjourn. All those who are in favor of adjourning will, when their names are called, answer "yea," those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 4, nays 218, answered "present" 2, not voting 199, as follows:

[Roll No. 83.]

YEAS—4.

Gillett	Greene, Mass.	Guernsey	Kindel
---------	---------------	----------	--------

NAYS—218.

Abercrombie	Blackmon	Byrnes, S. C.	Cox
Adair	Boober	Byrnes, Tenn.	Cramton
Adamson	Borchers	Callaway	Crisp
Allen	Britten	Cantrill	Cullop
Anderson	Brockson	Caraway	Curry
Ashbrook	Brown, W. Va.	Carlin	Danforth
Austin	Bryan	Casey	Davenport
Bailey	Buchanan, Ill.	Chandler, N. Y.	Decker
Bartlett	Bulkley	Church	Dent
Barton	Burke, S. Dak.	Claypool	Dershem
Beakes	Burke, Wis.	Coady	Dickinson
Beall, Tex.	Burnett	Connelly, Kans.	Dies

Difenderfer	Hayden	McKellar	Small
Dillon	Hedlin	McKenzie	Smith, Idaho
Donovan	Helgesen	McLaughlin	Smith, J. M. C.
Doolittle	Helm	Maguire, Nebr.	Smith, N. Y.
Doremus	Hill	Mann	Smith, Saml. W.
Doughton	Hinds	Mapes	Stafford
Eagan	Hinebaugh	Miller	Stedman
Eagle	Holland	Mitchell	Steenerson
Edwards	Houston	Moon	Stephens, Cal.
Esch	Hoxworth	Morgan, Okla.	Stephens, Miss.
Evans	Hughes, Ga.	Morrison	Stephens, Nebr.
Fairchild	Hull	Moss, Ind.	Stephens, Tex.
Falconer	Humphrey, Wash.	Murray	Stevens, Minn.
Ferris	Humphreys, Miss.	Neeley, Kans.	Stone
Fess	Igoe	Norton	Sutherland
Fields	Jacoway	O'Hair	Switzer
Finley	Johnson, Ky.	Oldfield	Taggart
Fitzgerald	Johnson, S. C.	Paige, Mass.	Talcott, N. Y.
FitzHenry	Johnson, Utah	Park	Tavener
Flood, Va.	Kahn	Parker, N. J.	Taylor, Ark.
Floyd, Ark.	Keating	Parker, N. Y.	Taylor, Colo.
Fordney	Kelly, Pa.	Peters	Ten Eyck
Foster	Kennedy, Iowa	Phelan	Thacher
Francis	Kent	Platt	Thomas
Gard	Kettner	Plumley	Thompson, Okla.
Gardner	Key, Ohio	Porter	Towner
Garner	Kinkaid	Pou	Tribble
Garrett, Teun.	Kirkpatrick	Quin	Underhill
Gill	Kitchin	Ragsdale	Underwood
Glass	Knowland, J. R.	Rainey	Vaughan
Godwin, N. C.	Konop	Raker	Vinson
Goeke	Korby	Reilly, Wis.	Volstead
Gordon	Langley	Rogers	Walsh
Goulden	Lazaro	Rothermel	Watkins
Gudger	Lee, Ga.	Rouse	Watson
Hamilton, Mich.	Lenroot	Rubey	Weaver
Hamilton, N. Y.	Leshner	Russell	Webb
Hardy	Lewis, Md.	Seldomridge	White
Harris	Lindbergh	Sherley	Williams
Hart	Lloyd	Sherwood	Witherspoon
Haugen	Lobeck	Sims	Young, N. Dak.
Hawley	Loneragan	Slayden	
Hay	McAndrews	Sloan	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Fowler Kennedy, R. I.

NOT VOTING—199.

Aiken	Dooling	Kreider	Rayburn
Ainey	Driscoll	Lafferty	Reed
Alexander	Drukker	La Follette	Reilly, Conn.
Anthony	Dunn	Langham	Riordan
Aswell	Dupré	Lee, Pa.	Roberts, Mass.
Avis	Edmonds	L'Engle	Roberts, Nev.
Baker	Elder	Lever	Rucker
Baltz	Estopinal	Levy	Rupley
Barchfeld	Faison	Lewis, Pa.	Sabath
Barkley	Farr	Lieb	Saunders
Barnhart	Fergusson	Lindquist	Scott
Bartholdt	Frear	Linthicum	Scully
Bathrick	French	Loft	Sells
Bell, Cal.	Gallagher	Logue	Shackleford
Bell, Ga.	Gallivan	McClellan	Shreve
Borland	Garrett, Tex.	McGillicuddy	Sinnott
Bowdle	George	McGuire, Okla.	Sisson
Brodbeck	Gerry	MacDonald	Slomp
Broussard	Gilmore	Madden	Smith, Md.
Brown, N. Y.	Gittins	Mahan	Smith, Minn.
Browne, Wis.	Goldfogle	Maher	Smith, Tex.
Browning	Good	Manahan	Sparkman
Bruckner	Goodwin, Ark.	Martin	Stanley
Brumbaugh	Gorman	Metz	Stevens, N. H.
Buchanan, Tex.	Graham, Ill.	Mondell	Stout
Burgess	Graham, Pa.	Montague	Stringer
Burke, Pa.	Gray	Moore	Summers
Butler	Green, Iowa	Morgan, La.	Talbott, Md.
Calder	Greene, Vt.	Morin	Taylor, Ala.
Campbell	Gregg	Moss, W. Va.	Taylor, N. Y.
Candler, Miss.	Griest	Mott	Temple
Cantor	Griffin	Mulkey	Thomson, Ill.
Carew	Hamill	Murdoch	Townsend
Carr	Hamlin	Neely, W. Va.	Treadway
Carter	Harrison	Nelson	Tuttle
Cary	Hayes	Nolan, J. I.	Vare
Clancy	Helvering	O'Brien	Vollmer
Clark, Fla.	Henry	Oglesby	Walker
Cline	Hensley	O'Shaunessy	Wallin
Collier	Hobson	Padgett	Walters
Connolly, Iowa	Howard	Page, N. C.	Whaley
Conry	Howell	Palmer	Whitacre
Cooper	Hughes, W. Va.	Patten, N. Y.	Wilson, Fla.
Copley	Hullings	Patton, Pa.	Wilson, N. Y.
Crosser	Johnson, Wash.	Peterson	Wingo
Dale	Jones	Post	Winslow
Davis	Keister	Powers	Woodruff
Deitrick	Kelley, Mich.	Price	Woods
Dixon	Kennedy, Conn.	Prouty	Young, Tex.
Donohoe	Kiess, Pa.	Rauch	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. SABATH with Mr. KEISTER.

Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.

Mr. WALKER with Mr. VARE.

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. EDMONDS.

Mr. BELL of Georgia with Mr. DUNN.

Mr. LEVER with Mr. MANAHAN.

Mr. WILSON of Florida with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. HENRY with Mr. MORIN.
 Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. PATTEN of New York with Mr. GRIEST.
 Mr. AIKEN with Mr. BELL of California.
 Mr. ALEXANDER with Mr. BARTHOLDT.
 Mr. ASWELL with Mr. BARCHFELD.
 Mr. BARKLEY with Mr. AINEY.
 Mr. BARNHART with Mr. ANTHONY.
 Mr. BORLAND with Mr. AVIS.
 Mr. SCULLY with Mr. BROWNING.
 Mr. BURGESS with Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin.
 Mr. CANDLE of Mississippi with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. CARTER with Mr. BUTLER.
 Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. DAVIS.
 Mr. CLINE with Mr. DRUKKER.
 Mr. COLLIER with Mr. FARR.
 Mr. CONRY with Mr. FREAR.
 Mr. DALE with Mr. CALDER.
 Mr. DIXON with Mr. CAMPBELL.
 Mr. DRISCOLL with Mr. FRENCH.
 Mr. DUPRÉ with Mr. COOPER.
 Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. GOOD.
 Mr. FAISON with Mr. CARY.
 Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. GREEN of Iowa.
 Mr. GALLIVAN with Mr. HOWELL.
 Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas with Mr. JOHNSON of Washington.
 Mr. GREGG with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. HAMLIN with Mr. KREIDER.
 Mr. HARRISON with Mr. LA FOLLETTE.
 Mr. GOLDFOGLE with Mr. HAYES.
 Mr. HELVERING with Mr. LANGHAM.
 Mr. HENSLEY with Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. HOWARD with Mr. LINDQUIST.
 Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania with Mr. MADDEN.
 Mr. LIEB with Mr. MARTIN.
 Mr. LINTHICUM with Mr. MONDELL.
 Mr. MONTAGUE with Mr. MOORE.
 Mr. NEELY of West Virginia with Mr. MOSS of West Virginia.
 Mr. PAGE of North Carolina with Mr. NELSON.
 Mr. RAUCH with Mr. PROUTY.
 Mr. RAYBURN with Mr. SCOTT.
 Mr. REILLY of Connecticut with Mr. SELLS.
 Mr. RUCKER with Mr. SHREVE.
 Mr. SAUNDERS with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.
 Mr. SHACKLEFORD with Mr. SINNOTT.
 Mr. SISSON with Mr. SLEMP.
 Mr. SMITH of Texas with Mr. TREADWAY.
 Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. SMITH of Minnesota.
 Mr. STOUT with Mr. POWERS.
 Mr. SUMNERS with Mr. TEMPLE.
 Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. WALLIN.
 Mr. WHALEY with Mr. WINSLOW.
 Mr. YOUNG of Texas with Mr. WOODS.
 Mr. MAHER with Mr. GREENE of Vermont.
 The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SLAYDEN, for two days, on account of business.

To Mr. WINGO, for the balance of the day, on account of illness.

To Mr. DONOVAN, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. ALEXANDER, for one week, on account of illness.

FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 21491, the fortifications appropriation bill, and pending that I ask unanimous consent that general debate may be limited to six and one half hours, one half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER] and the other half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 21491, and pending that motion he asks unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to six and one-half hours, one-half of which is to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARDNER) there were—ayes 140, noes 20.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. Houston in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, of which the Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 21491) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Houston, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 21491, the fortifications appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 18172. An act to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Seymour, Ind.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 3362. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, through the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Bureau of Fisheries, to make a survey of natural oyster beds, bars, and rocks, and barren bottoms contiguous thereto, in waters along the coast of and within the State of Texas; and

S. 3897. An act to authorize the Great Northern Railway Co. to revise the location of its right of way, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Sunday, February 21, 1915, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. MACDONALD, from the Committee on Labor, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 19015) to provide for the establishment of a national employment bureau in the Department of Labor, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1429), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 427) providing for the continuance of the Joint Commission to Investigate Indian Affairs, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1428), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 21518) to establish public highways along all section lines in the public lands of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 21519) to encourage the reclamation of certain arid lands in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 21520) for the coinage of a McKinley souvenir silver dollar in commemoration of the erection of a memorial to William McKinley, late President of the United States; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. HELGESEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 430) to authorize the Committees on Agriculture of the Senate and House to investigate a system of rural personal credit; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. NORTON: Memorial of the Legislature of North Dakota commending the action of its Representatives in Congress in voting for the Sheppard-Hobson resolution for national prohibition, and urging Congress to reconsider and pass it; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRUCKNER: A bill (H. R. 21521) for the relief of Adolph Fenton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 21522) granting an increase of pension to George Lutz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21523) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Hancock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: A bill (H. R. 21524) for the relief of Augustus G. Reynolds; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 21525) for the relief of John C. Kathan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 21526) for the relief of R. S. Settles; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21527) granting an increase of pension to Isam Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCLELLAN: A bill (H. R. 21528) granting an increase of pension to Ellen J. Stratton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 21529) granting pensions to Zella Barker, Eva G. Barker, Stella Barker, Gertrude Barker, Dora Barker, and Edna Barker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TEN EYCK: A bill (H. R. 21530) granting a pension to Mary Raleigh; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: Resolution (H. Res. 739) authorizing the appointment of William F. Cody upon the Capitol police force; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of German-Irish Alliance, of Passaic County, N. J., urging neutrality of Americans; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS: Memorial of the city council of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the reduction in salary of 350 letter carriers in the Chicago (Ill.) post office; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BEAKES: Petitions of W. W. Neesley and 10 citizens, of Jackson; Charles A. Mosman and 12 citizens, of Jackson; Rev. A. Siegenthaler and 16 citizens, of Jackson; George Berkaw and 12 citizens, of Detroit; H. W. Smith and 12 citizens, of Detroit; J. H. Letcher and 7 citizens, of Kenton; and A. H. Towne and 10 citizens, of Shelby; all in the State of Michigan, protesting against bill to amend the postal laws relative to freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of John Theurer and 19 citizens, of Ann Arbor, Mich., in favor of prohibiting the export of munitions of war to foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BELL of California: Petition of Silas Munsell and 940 citizens, of Pasadena, Los Angeles, Sierra Madre, Alhambra, Monrovia, San Gabriel, Glendale, Long Beach, and Covina, in the ninth congressional district of California, favoring House joint resolution No. 377, to prohibit the export of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war from the territory or any seaport of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROCKSON: Petitions of citizens of Wilmington, Del., asking for the adoption of H. J. Res. 377 and 378, S. 6688, and H. R. 19548, to prohibit the sale and export of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war to any of the friendly nations

at present at war in Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions adopted by citizens of Delaware, at a mass meeting in Wilmington, on February 14, 1915, favoring the passage of House joint resolutions 377 and 378, Senate bill 6688, and House bill 19548, to prohibit the sale and exportation of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war to any of the belligerents in the present European conflict; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of citizens of Kent County, Del., asking for the adoption of House joint resolutions 377 and 378, Senate bill 6688, or House bill 19548, to prohibit the sale and exportation of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war to any of the friendly nations at present at war in Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNING: Petition of 15 citizens of Gloucester City, N. J., protesting against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of members of the Roman Catholic Church, of New York, favoring exclusion of the Menace from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of A. L. Ortman, against any abridgment of the freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CARR: Petition of the citizens of Aleppo, Greene County, Pa., protesting against the amendment offered by Hon. J. J. FITZGERALD to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolution adopted by the Little Riostum Presbyterian Church, Fayette City, Pa., favoring the Weeks-Gillett resolution prohibiting polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution adopted by the Woman's Missionary Society of Brownsville, Pa., favoring the Weeks-Gillett resolution prohibiting polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURRY: Petition of citizens of Stockton, Cal., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DALE: Memorial of Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, protesting against the Deltrick amendment to the Army appropriation bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of American citizens in Paterson, N. J., protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Brotherhood of Railway Postal Clerks, Denver, Colo., protesting against war tax on salaries of clerks in the Railway Mail Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of F. T. Schwanke and 34 others, of Lime Ridge, Wis., protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS: Petition of citizens of Butte, Mont., against export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FESS: Petitions of citizens of the eighth district of Ohio, favoring the Hamill bill (H. R. 5139); to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: Petition of city council of Chicago, Ill., against reduction in salaries of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Memorial of board of directors of the associated employers of Indianapolis, favoring passage of the militia pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the National Industrial Traffic League, Chicago, Ill., relative to regulation of common carriers through the medium of the commerce act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of 326 citizens of California, favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Hugh Doherty, of California, favoring exclusion of the Menace and other publications from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Connecticut: Petition of Robert Emmet Literary Association, Torrington, Conn., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LIEB: Memorial of the Pocket Publishers' League, by O. J. Brooner, secretary-treasurer, presenting resolutions passed at Huntingburg, Ind., on February 13, favoring the passage of the bill which seeks to restore to the publishers of the country the privilege of exchanging advertising for mileage; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of S. F. Boslor, of Rockport, Ind., supporting bill 20644; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of International Molders' Union, No. 51, of Evansville, Ind., protesting against the discharge of American citizens in the Canal Zone; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of E. M. Scholz, J. H. Henke, John Wilbur, H. E. Hulseman, H. Karn, A. C. Froelich, Julius Doerius, Louis A. Genpel, C. Eckardt, F. H. Shoemaker, J. Stoeve, Jacob Lahr, Henry Luerrssen, J. H. Gerlich, Louis A. Wollenberger, John Farr, H. H. Wessling, F. H. Bosse, F. G. Haas, Jacob Kurtzman, William F. Horst, F. W. Ellerbusch, Henry Reters, Charles Schmacke, Henry Haas, Rev. A. Merkle, Henry Fuchs, Gustav Weber, Wilhelm Simon, John H. Ohring, Wilhelm Aufthauer, Christ Hoepna, Phillip Gerkmann, Julius Simon, Emil J. Wimpelberg, William J. Rech, C. H. Espenlaub, Henry Stahlknecht, William Krickhauer, J. N. Schneider, William Aberlee, Paul Pfeifer, William Rahm, Charles Hille, Julius Gruen, Richard Gruen, August Leich, Carl G. Viche, M. D., all of Evansville, Ind., favoring embargo on arms, ammunition, and munitions of war, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of John C. Fischer, of Evansville, Ind., and Rev. Ludwig von Loug, W. F. Dassel, Edwin Ahrens, Adolph Thomas, H. L. Bass, William Menke, August Susott, Louis Susott, Henry C. Gerick, Gustav Susott, Henry W. Blickman, A. W. Severott, August Jarvis, Lawrence Besing, Emil F. Halwes, Harry Holtz, H. F. Hebbler, Frank Harbert, Emil Holtz, C. C. Ayers, F. W. Kempe, and Frederick Schultz, all of Elberfeld, Ind., in favor of House joint resolution 377; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Z. T. Hedges, Fred Geier, and Albert Barton, of Boonville, Ind., favoring the Kern-Foster bill; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, petition of citizens of Evansville, Ind., presented by Dan P. Killinger, Robert Leigh, F. J. H. Hooge, Albert Gunther, Russell Wytenbach, and A. Homer Burket, favoring legislation to regulate economic functions of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of Anton Habeal, New Britain, Conn., relative to House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Petition of 62 citizens of Kingston, N. Y., favoring bills to prohibit export of war material from United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY of West Virginia: Papers filed in support of House bill 21529, granting pensions to Zella Barker, Eva G. Barker, Stella Barker, Gertrude Barker, Dora Barker, and Edna Barker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Theodore Restro, of Redding, Cal., protesting against the Hobson resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of National Traffic League, of Chicago, Ill., relative to regulation of common carriers through the medium of the commerce act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of B. F. Mitchell, of Red Bluff, Cal., favoring the adoption of some relief for the unemployed throughout the Nation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH: Petition of the City Council of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the reduction of the salaries of 350 postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of German-Irish Alliance, of Passaic County, N. J., favoring strict neutrality of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petition of citizens of Troy, Idaho, favoring legislation for the settlement of controversies between nations by an international court; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma: Petition of the Catholic Church of Purcell, Okla.; the Catholic Church of Lexington, Okla.; Bishop Meerschaert Council, Knights of Columbus, No. 916, Guthrie, Okla., against circulation of certain periodicals through the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petition of citizens of Elmira, N. Y., Chicago, Ill., and Washington, D. C., favoring strict neutrality of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WEBB: Petition of citizens of Conover, N. C., favoring Senate bill 6688, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of citizens of Paterson, N. J., favoring strict neutrality of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SUNDAY, February 21, 1915.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by Mr. BARTLETT as Speaker pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord, Thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations. Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God.

We are come to pay a tribute of respect to two chosen servants of the people and to record their life, character, and public services, that they may live in history as an inspiration and as an example to coming generations. The one passed on while serving as a Member of this House, the other while a Senator of the United States. To have been thus chosen as Members of this great legislative body is in itself a mark of distinction, indicative of mental strength, moral courage, and worthy endeavor.

They have finished the work Thou gavest them to do and have passed on to a service for which the experiences of this life have fitted them. We mourn their going, but look forward with faith, hope, love to the touch of their hand, the cheer of their voice and kindly smile. Be this our solace and the comfort of those who knew and loved them best in the home, in society where their genial presence will be missed. May we be prepared, when the summons comes, to pass with unperturbed spirit into that realm where love reigns supreme; and we will praise and magnify Thy holy name forever, through Him who taught us life and the immortality of the soul. Amen.

THE JOURNAL.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading and approval of the Journal be deferred until to-morrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal be postponed until to-morrow. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all who speak in eulogy to-day have permission to revise and extend their remarks, and that general leave to print be extended to all Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that those who speak to-day may have permission to extend their remarks, and that leave be granted to those who are not present and who desire to incorporate remarks in the RECORD to do so. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the order of the day.

The Clerk read as follows:

On motion of Mr. BARTLETT, by unanimous consent, *Ordered*, That Sunday, February 21, 1915, be set apart for services upon the life, character, and public services of Hon. AUGUSTUS O. BACON, late a Senator from the State of Georgia.

On motion of Mr. PETERS, by unanimous consent, *Ordered*, That Sunday, February 21, 1915, be set apart for services upon the life, character, and public services of Hon. FORREST GOODWIN, late a Representative from the State of Maine.

THE LATE SENATOR BACON.

Mr. PARK took the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia offers a resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 740.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the Hon. AUGUSTUS O. BACON, late a Senator from the State of Georgia, the business of the House be now suspended, to enable his associates to pay proper tribute to his high character and distinguished public services.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the House at the conclusion of the exercises of this day stand adjourned.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Resolved, That the Clerk send a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, born on the 20th of October, 1839, after having served his native State as soldier, as legislator, as speaker of the house of representatives, as trustee of the State University, and for 19 years as a United States Sena-

tor, AUGUSTUS OCTAVIUS BACON died on the 14th of February, 1914, ripe in years and full of honors. I had known him personally since my early boyhood and intimately for 35 years. Before his birth his father died, and while yet in infancy, before he was a year old, his mother passed to the great beyond to join the husband and father. He was reared by his grandmother. At an early age he entered the University of Georgia, from which he graduated with the degree of bachelor of arts, and soon thereafter he received the degree of bachelor of laws. For many years he was a trustee of the University of Georgia, and was such at the time of his death. There were conferred upon him by that university the degrees of bachelor of arts, bachelor of laws, master of arts, and doctor of laws. Shortly after beginning the practice of law he answered to the call to arms made upon her sons by the Southern Confederacy. He served in the Army of Virginia for two years and was afterwards transferred to Georgia and assigned to general staff duty. Soon after the close of the war he commenced the practice of law at Macon, Ga., where he resided until his death. As a lawyer he was studious; he mastered all subjects with consummate skill, and presented them to court and jury with convincing argument and logic.

During the years following the Civil War, known as the reconstruction period in Georgia, he gave his great powers to the task of rehabilitating the State and restoring its government to its own people. In recognition of his public services he was elected a member of the Georgia House of Representatives from the county of Bibb in 1870, and was successively reelected to that position for a period of 12 years. For eight years he was speaker of the Georgia House of Representatives, and in that office he evinced his wonderful familiarity with parliamentary law. He presided with great fairness and dignity, and was everywhere recognized as one of the most skillful parliamentarians that had ever presided over the Legislature of the State of Georgia. In every campaign, both local and national, Mr. BACON was an earnest champion of the cause of the Democratic Party, to which he always belonged. He was ready at all times to aid his party, and he rendered most effective service in its behalf. The Democratic national committee always availed itself of his services in the presidential campaigns, and his abilities were exerted in behalf of his party's candidates and in advocacy of its principles in many States. In 1894 he was elected to the United States Senate from the State of Georgia. While it is true that he was elected to this office by the legislature of his State, yet for the first time in the history of the State there had been held a primary in order that the voters might give expression to their choice for United States Senator, and when the legislature met the people had already declared by their votes that he was their choice for that high office. He entered the Senate in 1895, at the same time that I became a Member of the House of Representatives. In 1900, 1906, and again in 1912 the Democrats of the State of Georgia, in primary elections, selected him as United States Senator. In 1912, after the amendment providing for the election of United States Senators by the people was adopted, he was elected Senator by the people of the State, after having been nominated in the primary, being the first United States Senator elected by the people under the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution. From the day of his entrance into the Senate he became a commanding figure in that body and immediately attracted the attention of the Senate and of the country. He soon demonstrated that he was fully equipped in every way to meet promptly in debate every question that arose. During his term of service many of the most important questions which have engaged the attention of the Senate were considered. He participated in all the great debates that occurred there, oftentimes contending with the most distinguished Members of that body, and in no debate in which he engaged did he ever fail to demonstrate his ability to sustain and uphold the dignity and honor of his high office.

Intimately familiar with the history of our Republic, and thoroughly grounded and learned in the fundamental principles of our Government as contained in the charter of our liberties, the Constitution, he was ever its earnest defender, and no effort to infringe it, impair it, or destroy it was ever made that did not meet with prompt resistance from him. He believed in the traditions of our people and in the tradition of our Government, and at all times he stood firmly by them. Punctual in his attendance on the sessions of the Senate and assiduous in the performance of his duties, his great mentality was impressed upon nearly all the deliberations of that great body during the period of his service. Never did he permit his private business or personal fortunes to lure him from his duty as Senator. Although opposed vigorously in the last primary in which he was a candidate, he still remained at his